

THE WHITHAM EQUATIONS REVISITED

ROBERT CARROLL and JEN HSU CHANG

University of Illinois
Urbana, IL 61801*

November, 1996

Abstract

We survey some topics involving the Whitham equations, concentrating on the role of $\psi\psi^*$ (or square eigenfunctions) in averaging. Some connections to symplectic geometry and Seiberg-Witten theory are indicated.

1 INTRODUCTION

A preliminary sketch of some of this material was given in [15] and in view of several recent developments (cf. [8, 16, 17, 20, 22, 44, 56, 58, 59, 62, 64, 68]) we decided to expand and rewrite [15] in two parts, of which this is the first. The second part will deal with theory of kernels related to $\psi\psi^*$ (cf. [18]).

There are many physical situations where averaging procedures of various types are employed and we refer to [78] for a general background (see [25, 26, 28, 29, 37, 39, 40, 51, 53, 54, 55, 61, 66] for weakly deformed soliton lattices, multiphase averaging, etc.). The Whitham equations arise in this context and we will look at some of this here; we attempt to organize a subset of information in a coherent and more or less rigorous manner, while clarifying various formulas and assertions in the literature. Connections to dispersionless theory are indicated and material has been selected which will be useful in further studies of topological field theory (TFT), Landau-Ginzburg (LG) theory, Seiberg-Witten (SW) theory, etc. The exposition in this first paper is mainly expository but we indicate some new connections and results (cf. also [16, 17, 18, 20]). The principal theme involves averaging of square eigenfunctions for KdV or averaging of quantities related to $\psi\psi^*$ for KP, where ψ is the Baker-Akhiezer (BA) function; this point of view (along with general use of the BA function) is emphasized for derivation of Whitham equations, construction of differentials, and moduli considerations. Many basic formulas involving theta functions, differentials, etc. are also exhibited in order to make the text useful as a launching pad for further investigation.

2 CURVES AND MODULI

2.1 Riemann surfaces and BA functions

Following [4, 5, 9, 21, 27, 28, 38, 43, 58, 73] we take an arbitrary Riemann surface Σ of genus g , pick a point Q and a local variable $1/k$ near Q such that $k(Q) = \infty$, and, for illustration, take

*email: rcarroll@symcom.math.uiuc.edu

$q(k) = kx + k^2y + k^3t$. Let $D = P_1 + \dots + P_g$ be a non-special divisor of degree g and write ψ for the (unique up to a constant multiplier by virtue of the Riemann-Roch theorem) Baker-Akhiezer (BA) function characterized by the properties **(A)** ψ is meromorphic on Σ except for Q where $\psi(P)\exp(-q(k))$ is analytic and **(*)** $\psi \sim \exp(q(k))[1 + \sum_1^\infty (\xi_j/k^j)]$ near Q . **(B)** On Σ/Q , ψ has only a finite number of poles (at the P_i). In fact ψ can be taken in the form ($P \in \Sigma$, $P_0 \neq Q$)

$$\psi(x, y, t, P) = \exp\left[\int_{P_0}^P (xd\Omega^1 + yd\Omega^2 + td\Omega^3)\right] \cdot \frac{\Theta(\mathcal{A}(P) + xU + yV + tW + z_0)}{\Theta(\mathcal{A}(P) + z_0)} \quad (2.1)$$

where $d\Omega^1 = dk + \dots$, $d\Omega^2 = d(k^2) + \dots$, $d\Omega^3 = d(k^3) + \dots$, $U_j = \int_{B_j} d\Omega^1$, $V_j = \int_{B_j} d\Omega^2$, $W_j = \int_{B_j} d\Omega^3$ ($j = 1, \dots, g$), $z_0 = -\mathcal{A}(D) - K$, and Θ is the Riemann theta function. The symbol $\sim$ will be used generally to mean “corresponds to” or “is associated with”; occasionally it also denotes asymptotic behavior; this should be clear from the context. Here the $d\Omega_j$ are meromorphic differentials of second kind normalized via $\int_{A_k} d\Omega_j = 0$ (A_j, B_j are canonical homology cycles) and we note that $xd\Omega^1 + yd\Omega^2 + td\Omega^3 \sim dq(k)$ normalized. $\mathcal{A} \sim$ Abel-Jacobi map $\mathcal{A}(P) = (\int_{P_0}^P d\omega_k)$ where the $d\omega_k$ are normalized holomorphic differentials, $k = 1, \dots, g$, $\int_{A_j} d\omega_k = \delta_{jk}$, and $K = (K_j) \sim$ Riemann constants ($2K = -\mathcal{A}(K_\Sigma)$ where K_Σ is the canonical class of $\Sigma \sim$ equivalence class of meromorphic differentials). Thus $\Theta(\mathcal{A}(P) + z_0)$ has exactly g zeros (or vanishes identically. The paths of integration are to be the same in computing $\int_{P_0}^P d\Omega^i$ or $\mathcal{A}(P)$ and it is shown in [4, 5, 15, 27] that ψ is well defined (i.e. path independent). Then the ξ_j in **(*)** can be computed formally and one determines Lax operators L and A such that $\partial_y \psi = L\psi$ with $\partial_t \psi = A\psi$. Indeed, given the ξ_j write $u = -2\partial_x \xi_1$ with $w = 3\xi_1 \partial_x \xi_1 - 3\partial_x^2 \xi_1 - 3\partial_x \xi_2$. Then formally, near Q , one has $(-\partial_y + \partial_x^2 + u)\psi = O(1/k)\exp(q)$ and $(-\partial_t + \partial_x^3 + (3/2)u\partial_x + w)\psi = O(1/k)\exp(q)$ (i.e. this choice of u, w makes the coefficients of $k^n \exp(q)$ vanish for $n = 0, 1, 2, 3$). Now define $L = \partial_x^2 + u$ and $A = \partial_x^3 + (3/2)u\partial_x + w$ so $\partial_y \psi = L\psi$ and $\partial_t \psi = A\psi$. This follows from the uniqueness of BA functions with the same essential singularity and pole divisors (Riemann-Roch). Then we have, via compatibility $L_t - A_y = [A, L]$, a KP equation $(3/4)u_{yy} = \partial_x[u_t - (1/4)(6uu_x + u_{xxx})]$ and therefore such KP equations are parametrized by nonspecial divisors or equivalently by points in general position on the Jacobian variety $J(\Sigma)$. The flow variables x, y, t are put in by hand in **(A)** via $q(k)$ and then miraculously reappear in the theta function via $xU + yV + tW$; thus the Riemann surface itself contributes to establish these as linear flow variables on the Jacobian. The pole positions P_i do not vary with x, y, t and **(†)** $u = 2\partial_x^2 \log \Theta(xU + yV + tW + z_0) + c$ exhibits Θ as a tau function.

We recall also that a divisor D^* of degree g is dual to D (relative to Q) if $D + D^*$ is the null divisor of a meromorphic differential $d\hat{\Omega} = dk + (\beta/k^2)dk + \dots$ with a double pole at Q (look at $\zeta = 1/k$ to recognize the double pole). Thus $D + D^* - 2Q \sim K_\Sigma$ so $\mathcal{A}(D^*) - \mathcal{A}(Q) + K = -[\mathcal{A}(D) - \mathcal{A}(Q) + K]$. One can define then a function $\psi^*(x, y, t, P) = \exp(-kx - k^2y - k^3t)[1 + \xi_1^*/k + \dots]$ based on D^* (dual BA function) and a differential $d\hat{\Omega}$ with zero divisor $D + D^*$, such that $\phi = \psi\psi^*d\hat{\Omega}$ is meromorphic, having for poles only a double pole at Q (the zeros of $d\hat{\Omega}$ cancel the poles of $\psi\psi^*$). Thus $\psi\psi^*d\hat{\Omega} \sim \psi\psi^*(1 + (\beta/k^2 + \dots)dk)$ is meromorphic with a second order pole at ∞ , and no other poles. For $L^* = L$ and $A^* = -A + 2w - (3/2)u_x$ one has then $(\partial_y + L^*)\psi^* = 0$ and $(\partial_t + A^*)\psi^* = 0$. Note that the prescription above seems to specify for ψ^* ($\vec{U} = xU + yV + tW$, $z_0^* = -\mathcal{A}(D^*) - K$)

$$\psi^* \sim e^{-\int_{P_0}^P (xd\Omega^1 + yd\Omega^2 + td\Omega^3)} \cdot \frac{\Theta(\mathcal{A}(P) - \vec{U} + z_0^*)}{\Theta(\mathcal{A}(P) + z_0^*)} \quad (2.2)$$

In any event the message here is that for any Riemann surface Σ one can produce a BA function ψ with assigned flow variables $x, y, t, \dots$ and this ψ gives rise to a (nonlinear) KP equation with

solution u linearized on the Jacobian $J(\Sigma)$. For averaging with KP (cf. [15, 40, 51]) we can use formulas (cf. (2.1) and (2.2))

$$\psi = e^{px+Ey+\Omega t} \cdot \phi(Ux + Vy + Wt, P) \quad (2.3)$$

$$\psi^* = e^{-px-Ey-\Omega t} \cdot \phi^*(-Ux - Vy - Wt, P) \quad (2.4)$$

to isolate the quantities of interest in averaging (here $p = p(P)$, $E = E(P)$, $\Omega = \Omega(P)$, etc.) We think here of a general Riemann surface Σ_g with holomorphic differentials $d\omega_k$ and quasi-momenta and quasi-energies of the form $dp = d\Omega^1$, $dE = d\Omega^2$, $d\Omega = d\Omega^3, \dots$ ($p = \int_{P_0}^P d\Omega^1$ etc.) where the $d\Omega^j = d\Omega_j = d(\lambda^j + O(\lambda^{-1}))$ are meromorphic differentials of the second kind. Following [51] one could normalize now via $\Re \int_{A_j} d\Omega^k = \Re \int_{B_j} d\Omega^k = 0$. Then write e.g. $U_k = (1/2\pi i) \oint_{A_k} dp$ and $U_{k+g} = -(1/2\pi i) \oint_{B_k} dp$ ($k = 1, \dots, g$) with similar stipulations for $V_k \sim \oint d\Omega^2$, $W_k \sim \oint d\Omega^3$, etc. This leads to real $2g$ period vectors and evidently one could also normalize via $\oint_{A_m} d\Omega^k = 0$ or $\Im \oint_{A_m} d\Omega^k = \Im \oint_{B_m} d\Omega^k = 0$ (further we set $B_{jk} = \oint_{B_k} d\omega_j$).

2.2 General remarks on averaging

Averaging can be rather mysterious at first due to some hasty treatments and bad choices of notation - plus many inherent difficulties. Some of the clearest exposition seems to be in [7, 37, 39, 66, 78] whereas the more extensive developments in e.g. [25, 26, 28, 29, 51, 54] may be confusing at first, until one realizes what is going on.

One choice of background situation involves an examination of dispersionless limits with no concern for periodicity or Riemann surfaces (cf. here [3, 12, 13, 14, 41, 47, 74]). Thus given e.g. a KdV equation $u_t + 6uu_x + u_{xxx} = 0$ set $\epsilon x = X$ and $\epsilon t = T$ leading to $u_T^{\epsilon} + 6u^{\epsilon}u_X^{\epsilon} + \epsilon^2 u_{XXX}^{\epsilon} = 0$. The study of $u^{\epsilon} \rightarrow \hat{u}$ where $\hat{u}$ satisfies the Euler equation $\hat{u}_T + 6\hat{u}\hat{u}_X = 0$ is a very delicate matter, of great interest in applications and in PDE but we do not discuss this here (cf. [60, 76]). On the other hand the purely algebraic passage of the background mathematics of KdV (involving Lax operators, the KdV hierarchy, tau functions, vertex operators, etc.) to the corresponding background mathematics of the dispersionless theory, is relatively easy and will be indicated below. Moreover it is of great importance in an entirely different direction, namely in the study of topological field theory, strings, and 2-D gravity (see e.g. [1, 3, 12, 13, 14, 19, 23, 31, 32, 33, 53, 56, 57, 77]). We will insert such material later as appropriate.

Let us follow [53] (cf. also [52]) in order to have a suitably complicated example leading directly to matters of interest here, so as background we consider the KP equation

$$\frac{3}{4}\sigma^2 u_{yy} = \partial_x [u_t - \frac{3}{2}uu_x + \frac{1}{4}u_{xxx}] \quad (2.5)$$

($\sigma^2 = 1 \sim \text{KP-2}$; $\sigma^2 = -1 \sim \text{KP-1}$). Here $\sigma L \sim \partial_x^2 - u$ with $\sigma \partial_y \psi = (\partial_x^2 - u)\psi$ and $A \sim \partial_x^3 - (3/2)u\partial_x + w$, which is slightly different than before (to connect notations let $u \rightarrow -u$ and insert σ). Then one has the compatibility equations $[\partial_y - L, \partial_t - A] = 0$ as before and it should be noted that for any function $g(t)$, $t \sim x, y, t, t_4, \dots$, operators $\tilde{L} = gLg^{-1} + \partial_y g g^{-1}$ and $\tilde{A} = gAg^{-1} + \partial_t g g^{-1}$ could be used, corresponding to a new wave function $\tilde{\psi} = g\psi$. The notation of [53] also involves differentials $d\Omega_i \sim d\Omega^i$ where $d\Omega_i = dk^i(1 + O(1/k))$ and $\int_{A_k} d\Omega_j = 0$ with $U_j^k = (1/2\pi i) \int_{B_k} d\Omega_j$ (so $U_1^k \sim U_k$, $U_2^k \sim V_k$, and $U_3^k \sim W_k$, up to factors of $2\pi i$). There will be solutions ψ as before in (2.1) with potentials u given via (†). We recall that Riemann theta functions are more precisely

written as $\Theta(z|B)$ where $B \sim$ a certain matrix (cf. below), and $z \sim (z_1, \dots, z_g) \sim xU + yV + tW + z_0$ for example. One knows via [9, 30] that u of the form $(\dagger) u = 2\partial_x^2 \log \Theta(z|B) + c$ is a solution of KP if and only if the matrix B defining Θ is the B-period matrix of a Riemann surface determined via $\int_{B_k} d\omega_j$ (with z as defined). Now consider the spectral theory of 2-D periodic operators $(**)$ $(\sigma\partial_y - \partial_x^2 + u(x, y))\psi = 0$ where $u(x, y) = u(x + a_1, y) = u(x, y + a_2)$. Bloch solutions are defined via

$$\begin{aligned}\psi(x + a_1, y, w_1, w_2) &= w_1 \psi(x, y, w_1, w_2); \\ \psi(x, y + a_2, w_1, w_2) &= w_2 \psi(x, y, w_1, w_2)\end{aligned}\tag{2.6}$$

and we assume $\psi(0, 0, w_1, w_2) = 1$. The pairs $Q = (w_1, w_2)$ for which there exists such solutions is called the Floquet set Γ and the multivalued functions $p(Q)$ and $E(Q)$ such that $w_1 = \exp(ipa_1)$ with $w_2 = \exp(iEa_2)$ are called quasi-momentum and quasi-energy respectively. By a gauge transformation $\psi \rightarrow \exp(h(y))\psi$, with $\partial_y h(y)$ periodic one obtains solutions of $(**)$ with a new potential $\tilde{u} = u - \sigma\partial_y h$ so we can assume $\int_0^{a_1} u(x, y)dx = 0$.

For $M_0 = \sigma\partial_y - \partial_x^2$ (with $u = 0$) the Floquet set is parametrized by $k \in \mathbf{C}$ such that $w_1^0 = \exp(ika_1)$ and $w_2^0 = \exp(-k^2 a_2 / \sigma)$ and the Bloch solutions are $\psi(x, y, k) = \exp(ikx - k^2 y / \sigma)$. The adjoint Bloch solutions are $\psi^+(x, y, k) = \exp(-ikx + k^2 y / \sigma)$ satisfying $(\sigma\partial_y + \partial_x^2)\psi^+ = 0$. The image of the map $k \rightarrow (w_1^0, w_2^0) \in \mathbf{C}^2$ is the Floquet set for M_0 corresponding to the Riemann surface with intersections corresponding to pairs $k \neq k'$ such that $w_i^0(k) = w_i^0(k')$, $i = 1, 2$. This means $k - k' = (2\pi N / a_1)$ and $k^2 - (k')^2 = (2\pi i \sigma M / a_2)$ where N, M are integers, creating "resonant" points $k = k_{N,M} = (\pi N / a_1) - (i \sigma M a_1 / N a_2)$, $N \neq 0$, $k' = k_{-N, -M}$. Then for $k_0 \neq k_{N,M}$ and u sufficiently small one can construct a formal Bloch solution of $(**)$ in the form of a convergent perturbation series (for any σ). Thus outside of some neighborhoods of the resonant points one can obtain a Bloch solution $\tilde{\psi}(x, y, k_0)$ which is analytic in k_0 , but the extension of $\tilde{\psi}$ to a resonant domain can be tricky. For $\Re \sigma = 0$ (as in KP-1) the resonant points are dense on the real axis whereas for $\Re \sigma \neq 0$ (as in KP-2) there are only a finite number of resonant points in any finite domain of $\mathbf{C}$. In the latter case one can glue handles between domains around resonant points and create a Riemann surface Γ of Bloch solutions $\psi(x, y, Q)$, $Q \in \Gamma$. Moreover, if the potential u can be analytically extended into a domain $|\Im x| < \tau_1$, $|\Im y| < \tau_2$, then the technique can also be adapted even when u is not small. Such Bloch solutions, normalized by $\psi(0, 0, Q) = 1$, are meromorphic on Γ and in the case of a finite number of handles a one point compactification of Γ is obtained so that ψ is in fact the BA function for Γ . Generally speaking finite zone situations as in (2.1) with potentials given by Riemann theta functions are quasi-periodic in nature. To single out conditions for periodicity one asks for meromorphic differentials dp and dE on Γ having their only singularities at $Q \sim$ point at ∞ of the form $dp = dk(1 + O(k^{-2}))$ and $dE = i\sigma^{-1}dk^2(1 + O(k^{-3}))$, normalized so that all periods are real, and satisfying, for any cycle C on Γ , $\oint_C dp = (2\pi n_C / a_1)$ with $\oint_C dE = (2\pi m_C / a_2)$ where n_C, m_C are integers. Then the corresponding potentials $u(x, y)$ will have periods a_1 and a_2 in x and y , with multipliers $w_1(P) = \exp(ia_1 \int^P dp)$ and $w_2(P) = \exp(ia_2 \int^P dE)$. We go now to finite zone (or quasiperiodic) situations as in (2.1) with potentials as in $(\dagger)$, where $z \sim xU + yV + tW + z_0$ can be written as $(z_k) = [x \int_{b_k} \Omega^1 + y \int_{b_k} \Omega^2 + t \int_{b_k} \Omega^3 + z_k^0] = (\zeta_k + z_k^0)$, $k = 1, \dots, g$. Since $\Theta(z + 2\pi i N) = \Theta(z)$ we could set $\zeta = i\theta$ so that as a function of $\theta = (\theta_k)$, u is periodic of period 2π in each variable θ_k . Now one wants to consider modulated finite zone situations where solutions are of the form $u = u_0(xU + yV + tW|I) = u_0(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_g|I_1, \dots, I_n)$ where u_0 is periodic in the θ_j with $U, V, W = U, V, W(I)$. One assumes there will be slow variables $X = \epsilon x$, $Y = \epsilon y$, and $T = \epsilon t$ with fast variables x, y, t so that "asymptotic" solutions

$$u = u_0\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon}\hat{S}(X, Y, T)|I(X, Y, T)\right) + \epsilon u_1(x, y, t) + \epsilon^2 u_2(x, y, t) + \dots\tag{2.7}$$

can be envisioned. In practice the parameters I_k depend on the moduli of our Riemann surface, which are then allowed to change smoothly with the slow variables X, Y, T (so U, V, W also can change), and one looks for solutions (2.7) with uniformly bounded u_1 . We do not look for convergence of the series in (2.7) nor check any other features of “asymptotic solution” or “asymptotic series”. Such procedures are standard in the study of what are called weakly deformed soliton lattices and we emphasize that the introduction of slow variables here is an assumption based on modulated wave trains.

2.3 Hyperelliptic curves and KdV averaging

One knows that hyperelliptic curves play a special role in the theory of algebraic curves and Riemann surfaces (see e.g. [4, 5, 9, 15, 21, 35, 36, 37, 40, 42, 67, 69, 72]). For hyperelliptic Riemann surfaces one can pick any $2g + 2$ points $\lambda_j \in \mathbf{P}^1$ and there will be a unique hyperelliptic curve Σ_g with a 2-fold map $f : \Sigma_g \rightarrow \mathbf{P}^1$ having branch locus $B = \{\lambda_j\}$. Since any 3 points $\lambda_i, \lambda_j, \lambda_k$ can be sent to $0, 1, \infty$ by an automorphism of $\mathbf{P}^1$ the general hyperelliptic surface of genus g can be described by $(2g + 2) - 3 = 2g - 1$ points on $\mathbf{P}^1$. Since f is unique up to an automorphism of $\mathbf{P}^1$ any hyperelliptic Σ_g corresponds to only finitely many such collections of $2g - 1$ points so locally there are $2g - 1$ (moduli) parameters. Since the moduli space of algebraic curves has dimension $3g - 3$ one sees that for $g \geq 3$ the generic Riemann surface is nonhyperelliptic whereas for $g = 2$ all Riemann surfaces are hyperelliptic (with 3 moduli). For $g = 1$ we have tori or elliptic curves with one modulus τ and $g = 0$ corresponds to $\mathbf{P}^1$. In many papers on soliton mathematics and integrable systems one takes real distinct branch points $\lambda_j, 1 \leq j \leq 2g + 1$, and ∞ , with $\lambda_1 < \lambda_2 < \dots < \lambda_{2g+1} < \infty$ and

$$\mu^2 = \prod_{j=1}^{2g+1} (\lambda - \lambda_j) = P_{2g+1}(\lambda, \lambda_j) \quad (2.8)$$

as the defining equation for Σ_g . Evidently one could choose $\lambda_1 = 0, \lambda_2 = 1$ in addition so for $g = 1$ we could use $0 < 1 < u < \infty$ for a familiar parametrization with elliptic integrals, etc. One can take $d\lambda/\mu, \lambda d\lambda/\mu, \dots, \lambda^{g-1} d\lambda/\mu$ as a basis of holomorphic differentials on Σ_g but usually one takes linear combinations of these denoted by $d\omega_j, 1 \leq j \leq g$, normalized via $\oint_{A_i} d\omega_j = \delta_{ij}$, with period matrix defined via $\oint_{B_i} d\omega_j = \Pi_{ij}$. The matrix $\Pi = (\Pi_{ij})$ is symmetric with $\Im \Pi > 0$ and it determines the curve. Frequently in situations arising from KdV (Korteweg-deVries equation) for example one regards the intervals $[\lambda_1, \lambda_2], \dots, [\lambda_{2g+1}, \infty)$ as spectral bands and intervals $(\lambda_2, \lambda_3), \dots, (\lambda_{2g}, \lambda_{2g+1})$ as gaps with the a_i cycles around $(\lambda_{2i}, \lambda_{2i+1})$ ($i = 1, \dots, g$). One will also want to consider another representation of hyperelliptic curves of genus g via

$$\mu^2 = \prod_{j=0}^{2g+1} (\lambda - \lambda_j) = P_{2g+2}(\lambda, \lambda_j) \quad (2.9)$$

where ∞ is now not a branch point and in fact there are two points $\mu_{\pm}$ corresponding to $\lambda = \infty$.

We recall next some of the results and techniques of [37, 66] where one can see explicitly the nature of things. The presentation here follows [15]. First from [66], in a slightly different notation, write $q_t = 6qq_x - q_{xxx}$ with Lax pair $L = -\partial_x^2 + q, B = -4\partial_x^3 + 3(q\partial_x + \partial_x q), L_t = [B, L], L\psi = \lambda\psi$, and $\psi_t = B\psi$. Let ψ and ϕ be two solutions of the Lax pair equations and set $\Psi = \psi\phi$; these are the very important “square eigenfunctions” which arise in many ways with interesting and varied meanings (cf. [10, 11, 12, 13, 14]). Evidently Ψ satisfies

$$[-\partial_x^3 + 2(q\partial_x + \partial_x q)]\Psi = 4\lambda\partial_x\Psi; \partial_t\Psi = -2q_x\Psi + 2(q + 2\lambda)\partial_x\Psi \quad (2.10)$$

From (2.10) one finds immediately the conservation law **(C)**: $\partial_t[\Psi] + \partial_x[6(q-2\lambda)\Psi - 2\partial_x^2\Psi] = 0$. If one looks for solutions of (2.10) of the form $\Psi(x, t, \lambda) = 1 + \sum_1^\infty [\Psi_j(x, t)]\lambda^{-j}$ as $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$ then one obtains a recursion relation for polynomial densities

$$\partial_x \Psi_{j+1} = [-\frac{1}{2}\partial_x^3 + (q\partial_x + \partial_x q)]\Psi_j \quad (j = 1, 2, \dots); \quad \Psi_0 = 1 \quad (2.11)$$

Now consider the operator $L = -\partial_x^2 + q$ in $L^2(-\infty, \infty)$ with spectrum consisting of closed intervals separated by exactly N gaps in the spectrum. The $2N + 1$ endpoints λ_k of these spectral bands are denoted by $-\infty < \lambda_0 < \lambda_1 < \dots < \lambda_{2N} < \infty$ and called the simple spectrum of L . They can be viewed as constants of motion for KdV when L has this form. We are dealing here with the hyperelliptic Riemann surface determined via $R^2(\lambda) = \prod_0^{2N} (\lambda - \lambda_k)$ (∞ is a branch point) and one can think of a manifold $\mathcal{M}$ of N -phase waves with fixed simple spectrum as an N -torus based on $\theta_j \in [0, 2\pi)$. Hamiltonians in the KdV hierarchy generate flows on this torus and one writes $q = q_N(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_N)$ (the θ variables originate as in our previous discussion if we use theta functions for the integration - cf. also below). Now there is no y variable so let us write $\theta_j = x\kappa_j + tw_j$ (we will continue to use $d\omega_j$ for normalized holomorphic differentials) For details concerning the Riemann surface we refer to [5, 9, 27, 37, 69] and will summarize here as follows. For any q_N as indicated one can find functions $\mu_j(x, t)$ via $\Psi(x, t, \lambda) = \prod_1^N (\lambda - \mu_j(x, t))$ where $\mu_j(x, t) \in [\lambda_{2j-1}, \lambda_{2j}]$ and satisfies

$$\partial_x \mu_j = -2i(R(\mu_j)/\prod_{i \neq j} (\mu_j - \mu_i)); \quad (2.12)$$

$$\partial_t \mu_j = -2i[2(\sum_0^{2N} \lambda_k - 2\sum_{i \neq j} \mu_i)] \cdot (R(\mu_j)/\prod_{i \neq j} (\mu_j - \mu_i))$$

In fact the μ_j live on the Riemann surface of $R(\lambda)$ in the spectral gaps and as x increases μ_j travels from λ_{2j-1} to λ_{2j} on one sheet and then returns to λ_{2j-1} on the other sheet; this path will be called the j^{th} μ -cycle ($\sim A_j$). In the present context we will write the theta function used for integration purposes as $\Theta(\mathbf{z}, \tau) = \sum_{\mathbf{m} \in \mathbf{Z}^N} \exp[\pi i(2(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{z}) + (\mathbf{m}, \tau \mathbf{m}))]$ where $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbf{Z}^N$ and τ denotes the $N \times N$ period matrix (τ is symmetric with $\Im \tau > 0$). We take canonical cuts A_i, B_i ($i = 1, \dots, N$) and let $d\omega_j$ be holomorphic differentials normalized via $\int_{a_j} d\omega_k = \delta_{jk}$ (the cycle A_j corresponds to a loop around the cut A_j). Then q_N can be represented in the form

$$q_N(x, t) = \Lambda + \Gamma - 2\partial_x^2 \log \Theta(\mathbf{z}(x, t); \tau); \quad \Lambda = \sum_0^{2N} \lambda_j; \quad (2.13)$$

$$\tau = (\tau_{ij}) = (\oint_{B_i} d\omega_j); \quad \tau_{ij}^* = -\tau_{ij}; \quad \Gamma = -2 \sum_1^N \oint_{A_j} \lambda d\omega_j$$

and $\mathbf{z}(x, t) = -2i[\mathbf{c}^N(x-x_0) + 2(\Lambda\mathbf{c}^N + 2\mathbf{c}^{N-1})t] + \mathbf{d}$ where $(\mathbf{c}^N)_i = c_{iN}$ arises from the representation $d\omega_i = (\sum_1^N c_{ij}\lambda^{j-1})[d\lambda/R(\lambda)]$ ($\mathbf{d}$ is a constant whose value is not important here). Then the wave number and frequency vectors can be defined via $\vec{\kappa} = -4i\pi\tau^{-1}\mathbf{c}^N$ and $\vec{w} = -8i\pi\tau^{-1}[\Lambda\mathbf{c}^N + 2\mathbf{c}^{N-1}]$ with $\theta_j(x, t) = \kappa_j x + w_j t + \theta_j^0$ (where the θ_j^0 represent initial phases).

To model the modulated wave now one writes now $q = q_N(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_N; \vec{\lambda})$ where $\lambda_j \sim \lambda_j(X, T)$ and $\vec{\lambda} \sim (\lambda_j)$. Then consider the first $2N+1$ polynomial conservation laws arising from (2.10) - (2.11) and **C** for example (cf. below for KP) and write these as $\partial_t \mathcal{T}_j(q) + \partial_x \mathcal{X}_j(q) = 0$ (explicit formulas are given

in [37] roughly as follows). We note that the adjoint linear KdV equation (governing the evolution of conserved densities) is $\partial_t \gamma_j + \partial_x^3 \gamma_j - 6q \partial_x \gamma_j = 0$ ($\gamma_j \sim \nabla H_j$) and (2.11) has the form $\partial \gamma_{j+1} = -(1/2) \partial^3 + q \partial + \partial q \gamma_j$. One then rewrites this to show that $6q \partial_x \gamma_j = \partial_x [6\gamma_{j+1} - 6q \gamma_j + 3\partial^2 \gamma_j]$ so that the adjoint equation becomes

$$\partial_t \gamma_j + \partial [-2\partial^2 \gamma_j + 6q \gamma_j - 6\gamma_{j+1}] = 0 \quad (2.14)$$

which leads to (2.15) and (2.19) below (after simplification of (2.14)). Then for the averaging step, write $\partial_t = \epsilon \partial_T$, etc., and average over the fast variable x to obtain

$$\partial_T < \mathcal{T}_j(q_N) > + \partial_X < \mathcal{X}_j(q_N) > = 0 \quad (2.15)$$

((2.15) makes the first order term in ϵ vanish). The procedure involves averages

$$< \mathcal{T}_j(q_N) > = \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2L} \int_{-L}^L \mathcal{T}_j(q_N) dx \quad (2.16)$$

for example (with a similar expression for $< \mathcal{X}_j(q_N) >$) and an argument based on ergodicity is used. Thus if the wave numbers κ_j are incommensurate the trajectory $\{q_N(x, t); x \in (-\infty, \infty)\}$ will densely cover the torus $\mathcal{M}$. Hence we can replace x averages with

$$< \mathcal{T}_j(q_N) > = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^N} \int_0^{2\pi} \cdots \int_0^{2\pi} \mathcal{T}_j(q_N(\vec{\theta})) \prod_1^N d\theta_j \quad (2.17)$$

For computational purposes one can change the θ integrals to μ integrals and obtain simpler calculations. By this procedure one obtains a system of $2N + 1$ first order partial differential equations for the $2N + 1$ points $\lambda_j(X, T)$, or equivalently for the physical characteristics $(\vec{\kappa}(X, T), \vec{w}(X, T))$ (plus $< q_N >$). One can think of freezing the slow variables in the averaging and it is assumed that (2.15) is the correct first order description of the modulated wave.

The above argument may or may not have sounded convincing but it was in any case rather loose. Let us be more precise following [37]. One looks at the KdV Hamiltonians beginning with $H = H(q) = \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} (1/2L) \int_{-L}^L (q^2 + (1/2)q_x^2) dx$ (this form is appropriate for quasi-periodic situations). Then $q_t = \{q, H\}$ where $\{f, g\} = \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} (1/2L) \int_{-L}^L (\delta f / \delta q) \partial_x (\delta g / \delta q) dx$ (averaged Gardner bracket). The other Hamiltonians are found via

$$\partial \frac{\delta H_{m+1}}{\delta q} = (q \partial + \partial q - \frac{1}{2} \partial^3) \frac{\delta H_m}{\delta q} \quad (m \geq 0); \quad \frac{\delta H_0}{\delta q} = 1 \quad (2.18)$$

where $\gamma_j \sim \nabla H_j \sim (\delta H_j / \delta q)$ (cf. here [9, 37]). It is a general situation in the study of symmetries and conserved gradients (cf. [10]) that symmetries will satisfy the linearized KdV equation $(\partial_t - 6\partial_x q + \partial_x^3)Q = 0$ and conserved gradients will satisfy the adjoint linearized KdV equation $(\partial_t - 6q \partial_x + \partial_x^3)Q^\dagger = 0$; the important thing to notice here is that one is linearizing about a solution q of KdV. Thus in our averaging processes the function q , presumed known, is inserted in the integrals. This leads then to

$$\mathcal{T}_j(q) = \frac{\delta H_j}{\delta q}; \quad \mathcal{X}_j(q) = -2\partial_x^2 \frac{\delta H_j}{\delta q} - 6 \frac{\delta H_{j+1}}{\delta q} + 6q \frac{\delta H_j}{\delta q} \quad (2.19)$$

with (2.15) holding, where $< \partial^2 \phi > = 0$ implies

$$< \mathcal{X}_j > = \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2L} \int_{-L}^L (-6 \frac{\delta H_{j+1}}{\delta q_N} + 6q_N \frac{\delta H_j}{\delta q_N}) dx \quad (2.20)$$

In [37] the integrals are then simplified in terms of μ integrals and expressed in terms of abelian differentials. This is a beautiful and important procedure linking the averaging process to the Riemann surface and is summarized in [66] as follows. One defines differentials

$$\hat{\Omega}_1 = -\frac{1}{2}[\lambda^N - \sum_1^N c_j \lambda^{j-1}] \frac{d\lambda}{R(\lambda)} \quad (2.21)$$

$$\hat{\Omega}_2 = [-\frac{1}{2}\lambda^{N+1} + \frac{1}{4}(\sum \lambda_j)\lambda^N + \sum_1^N E_j \lambda^{j-1}] \frac{d\lambda}{R(\lambda)}$$

where the c_j , E_j are determined via $\oint_{b_i} \hat{\Omega}_1 = 0 = \oint_{b_i} \hat{\Omega}_2$ ($i = 1, 2, \dots, N$). Then it can be shown that

$$\langle \Psi \rangle \sim \langle \mathcal{T} \rangle \sim \sum_0^\infty \frac{\langle \mathcal{T}_j \rangle}{(2\mu)^j}; \quad \langle \mathcal{X} \rangle \sim \sum_0^\infty \frac{\langle \mathcal{X}_j \rangle}{(2\mu)^j} \quad (2.22)$$

with $\hat{\Omega}_1 \sim \langle \mathcal{T} \rangle (d\xi/\xi^2)$ and $\langle \mathcal{X} \rangle (d\xi/\xi^2) \sim 12[(d\xi/\xi^4) - \hat{\Omega}_2]$ where $\mu = \xi^{-2} \rightarrow \infty$ ($\mu \sim (1/\sqrt{\xi})^{1/2}$) so $d\mu = -2\xi^{-3}d\xi \Rightarrow (d\xi/\xi^2) \sim -(\xi/2)d\mu \sim -(d\mu/2\sqrt{\mu})$. Since $\hat{\Omega}_1 = O(\mu^N/\mu^{N+(1/2)})d\mu = O(\mu^{-(1/2)}d\mu)$, $\hat{\Omega}_2 = O(\mu^{1/2})d\mu$ (with lead term $-(1/2)$) we obtain $\langle \Psi \rangle \sim \langle \mathcal{T} \rangle = O(1)$ and $\langle \mathcal{X} \rangle = O(1)$. Thus (2.10), (2.11), (C) generate all conservation laws simultaneously with $\langle \mathcal{T}_j \rangle$ (resp. $\langle \mathcal{X}_j \rangle$) giving rise to $\hat{\Omega}_1$ (resp. $\hat{\Omega}_2$). It is then proved that all of the modulational equations are determined via the equation

$$\partial_T \hat{\Omega}_1 = 12 \partial_X \hat{\Omega}_2 \quad (2.23)$$

where the Riemann surface is thought of as depending on X, T through the points $\lambda_j(X, T)$. In particular if the first $2N+1$ averaged conservation laws are satisfied then so are all higher averaged conservation laws. These equations can also be written directly in terms of the λ_j as Riemann invariants via $\partial_T \lambda_j = S_j \partial_X \lambda_j$ for $j = 0, 1, \dots, 2N$ where S_j is a computable characteristic speed (cf. (2.32)-(2.33)). Thus we have displayed the prototypical model for the Whitham or modulational equations.

Another way of looking at some of this goes as follows. We will consider surfaces defined via $R(\Lambda) = \prod_1^{2g+1} (\Lambda - \Lambda_i)$. For convenience take the branch points Λ_i real with $\Lambda_1 < \dots < \Lambda_{2g+1} < \infty$. This corresponds to spectral bands $[\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2], \dots, [\Lambda_{2g}, \Lambda_{2g+1}]$ and gaps $(\Lambda_2, \Lambda_3), \dots, (\Lambda_{2g}, \Lambda_{2g+1})$ with the A_i cycles around the gaps (i.e. $a_i \sim (\Lambda_{2i}, \Lambda_{2i+1})$, $i = 1, \dots, g$). The notation is equivalent to what preceeds with a shift of index. For this kind of situation one usually defines the period matrix via $iB_{jk} = \oint_{B_k} \omega_j$ and sets

$$\oint_{A_k} d\omega_j = 2\pi \delta_{jk} \quad (j, k = 1, \dots, g); \quad d\omega_j = \sum_1^g \frac{c_{jq} \Lambda^{q-1} d\Lambda}{\sqrt{R(\Lambda)}} \quad (2.24)$$

(cf. [5, 9, 15]). The B_i cycles can be drawn from a common vertex (P_0 say) passing through the gaps $(\Lambda_{2i}, \Lambda_{2i+1})$. One chooses now e.g. $p = \int dp$ and $\Omega = \int d\Omega$ in the form

$$p(\Lambda) = \int dp(\Lambda) = \int \frac{\mathcal{P}(\Lambda) d\Lambda}{2\sqrt{R(\Lambda)}}; \quad \mathcal{P} = \Lambda^g + \sum_1^g a_j \Lambda^{g-j}; \quad (2.25)$$

$$\Omega(\Lambda) = \int d\Omega(\Lambda) = \int \frac{6\Lambda^{g+1} + \mathcal{O}(\Lambda)}{\sqrt{R(\Lambda)}} d\Lambda; \quad \mathcal{O} = \sum_0^g b_j \Lambda^{g-j}; \quad b_0 = -3 \sum_1^{2g+1} \Lambda_i$$

with normalizations $\int_{\Lambda_{2i}}^{\Lambda_{2i+1}} dp(\Lambda) = \int_{\Lambda_{2i}}^{\Lambda_{2i+1}} d\Omega(\Lambda) = 0$; $i = 1, \dots, g$. We note that one is thinking here of (*) $\psi = \exp[ipx + i\Omega t] \cdot$ theta functions (cf. (2.1) with e.g. $p(\Lambda) = -i\overline{(\log\psi)_x}$; $\Omega(\Lambda) = -i\overline{(\log\psi)_t}$). Recall that the notation $<, >_x$ simply means x -averaging (or ergodic averaging) and $\overline{(\log\psi)_x} \sim <(\log\psi)_x>_x \neq 0$ here since e.g. $(\log\psi)_x$ is not bounded. Observe that (*) applies to any finite zone quasi-periodic situation. The KdV equation here arises from $L\psi = \Lambda\psi$, $L = -\partial^2 + q$, $\partial_t\psi = A\psi$, $A = 4\partial^3 - 6q\partial - 3q_x$ and there is no need to put this in a more canonical form since this material is only illustrative.

In this context one has also the Kruskal integrals $I_0, \dots, I_{2g}$ which arise via a generating function

$$p(\Lambda) = -i <(\log\psi)_x>_x = \sqrt{\Lambda} + \sum_0^\infty \frac{I_s}{(2\sqrt{\Lambda})^{2s+1}} \quad (2.26)$$

where $I_s = <P_s>_x = \overline{P_s}$ ($s = 0, 1, \dots$) with $-i\overline{(\log\psi)_x} = \sqrt{\Lambda} + \sum_0^\infty [P_s/(2\sqrt{\Lambda})^{2s+1}]$. Similarly

$$-i\overline{(\log\psi)_t} = -i\frac{A\psi}{\psi} = 4(\sqrt{\Lambda})^3 + \sum_0^\infty \frac{\Omega_s}{(2\sqrt{\Lambda})^{2s+1}} \quad (2.27)$$

and one knows $\partial_t P_s = \partial_x \Omega_s$ since ($\spadesuit$) $[(\log\psi)_x]_t = [(\log\psi)_t]_x$. The expansions are standard (cf. [12, 13, 14, 15]). Now consider a “weakly deformed” soliton lattice of the form

$$\theta(\tau|B) = \sum_{-\infty < n_1 < \dots < n_m < \infty} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \sum_{j,k} B_{jk} n_j n_k + i \sum_j n_j \tau_j\right) \quad (2.28)$$

with the Λ_i ($i = 1, \dots, 2g+1$) (or equivalently the parameters $u^i = I_i$; $i = 0, \dots, 2g$) slowly varying functions of x, t (e.g. $u^i = u^i(X, T)$, $X = \epsilon x$, $T = \epsilon t$, $i = 0, 1, \dots, 2m$). Now one wants to obtain a version of (2.23) directly via ($\spadesuit$). Thus insert the slow variables in ($\spadesuit$) and average, using $\epsilon\partial_X$ or $\epsilon\partial_T$ in the external derivatives, to obtain

$$\partial_T \overline{(\log\psi)_x} = \partial_X \overline{(\log\psi)_t} \quad (2.29)$$

or $\partial_T p(\Lambda) = \partial_X E(\Lambda)$. Then from (2.25) differentiating in Λ one gets

$$\partial_T dp = \partial_X d\Omega \quad (2.30)$$

Now (recall $\partial_t P_s = \partial_x \Omega_s$) expanding (2.30) in powers of $(\sqrt{\Lambda})^{-1}$ one obtains the slow modulation equations in the form

$$\partial_T u^s = \partial_X \bar{\Omega}_s \quad (s = 0, \dots, 2g) \quad (2.31)$$

where $\bar{\Omega}_s$ is a function of the u^i ($0 \leq i \leq 2g$). This leads to equations

$$\partial_T \Lambda_i = v_i(\Lambda_1, \dots, \Lambda_{2g+1}) \partial_X \Lambda_i \quad (i = 1, \dots, 2g+1) \quad (2.32)$$

for the branch points Λ_k as Riemann invariants. The characteristic “velocities” have the form

$$v_i = \left. \frac{d\Omega}{dp} \right|_{\Lambda=\Lambda_i} = 2 \frac{6\Lambda_i^{g+1} + \Omega(\Lambda_i)}{p(\Lambda_i)} \quad (1 \leq i \leq 2g+1) \quad (2.33)$$

To see this simply multiply (2.30) by $(\Lambda - \Lambda_i)^{3/2}$ and pass to limits as $\Lambda \rightarrow \Lambda_i$.

2.4 Extension to KP

Given some knowledge of symmetries as sketched in [10] for example one is tempted to rush now to an immediate attempt at generalizing the preceeding results to finite zone KP via the following facts. The KP flows can be written as $\partial_n u = K_n(u)$ where the K_n are symmetries satisfying (in the notation of [10]) the linearized KP equation $\partial_3 \beta = (1/4)\partial^3 \beta + 3\partial(u\beta) + (3/4)\partial^{-1}\partial_y^2 \beta = K'[\beta]$. The conserved densities or gradients γ satisfy the adjoint linearized KP equation $\partial_3 \gamma = (1/4)\partial^3 \gamma + 3u\partial\gamma + (3/4)\partial^{-1}\partial_y^2 \gamma$. Then, replacing the square eigenfunctions by $\psi\psi^*$ one has e.g. $\psi\psi^* = \sum_0^\infty s_n \lambda^{-n}$ where $s_n \sim \gamma_n$. Further $\partial_n u = K_{n+1} = \partial s_{n+1} = \partial \text{Res } L^n = \partial \nabla \hat{I}_{n+1}$ where $\nabla f \sim \delta f / \delta u$ ($\text{Res } L^n = nH_{n-1}^1$ is generally used in the multipotential theory). We are working here in a single potential theory where all potentials u_i in $L = \partial + \sum_1^\infty u_{i+1}\partial^{-i}$ are expressed in terms of $u_2 = u$ via operators with ∂ and ∂^{-1} . One uses here the Poisson bracket $\{f, g\} = \int \int (\delta f / \delta u) \partial (\delta g / \delta u) dx dy$ (Gardner bracket). Let us retrace the argument from [37] and see what applies for KP. Thus one has $s_{n+1} \sim \gamma_{n+1} \sim \nabla \hat{I}_{n+1}$ as conserved gradients satisfying the adjoint linear KP equation (**) $\partial_t \gamma = (1/4)\partial^3 \gamma + 3u\partial\gamma + (3/4)\partial^{-1}\partial_y^2 \gamma$. The nonlocal term ∂^{-1} here could conceivably change some of the analysis. We need first a substitute for (2.11) or else a direct way of rewriting the adjoint equation as perhaps $\partial_t[A] + \partial_x[B] + \partial_y[C] = 0$. To get such a formula one thinks of differentiating the adjoint linearized KP equation to get

$$\partial_t[\partial\gamma] + \partial[\frac{1}{4}\partial^3\gamma + 3u\partial\gamma] + \partial_y[\frac{3}{4}\partial_y\gamma] = 0 \quad (2.34)$$

This removes all of the nonlocal terms and one doesn't have to deal with $\partial[(3/4)\partial^{-1}\partial_y^2\gamma]$ for example; however it leads to a redundant situation. Let us try instead

$$\partial_t[\gamma] + \partial[\frac{1}{4}\partial^2\gamma + 3\partial^{-1}u\partial\gamma] + \partial_y[\frac{3}{4}\partial_y\partial^{-1}\gamma] = 0 \quad (2.35)$$

One expects that $\langle \partial^2\gamma \rangle = 0 = \langle \partial_y\partial^{-1}\gamma \rangle$ and we take $\hat{L} = 3\partial^{-1}(u_0\partial\gamma)$ so that, averaging as in KdV, one obtains

$$\partial_T \langle \gamma \rangle + \partial_X \langle \hat{L} \rangle = 0 \quad (2.36)$$

which conceivably might be useful. This is discussed later.

3 AVERAGING WITH $\psi^*\psi$

Let us look now at [51] but in the spirit of [40]. We will expand upon this with some modifications in order to obtain a visibly rigorous procedure (cf. also [16]). Thus consider KP in the form (2.5): $3\sigma^2 u_{yy} + \partial_x(4u_t - 6uu_x + u_{xxx}) = 0$ via compatibility $[\partial_y - L, \partial_t - A] = 0$ where $L = \sigma^{-1}(\partial^2 - u)$ and $A = \partial^3 - (3/2)u\partial + w$ ($\sigma^2 = 1$ is used in [40] which we follow for convenience but the procedure should work in general with minor modifications - note ∂ means ∂_x and $u \rightarrow -u$ in the development of (2.1)). We have then $(\partial_y - L)\psi = 0$ with $(\partial_t - A)\psi = 0$ and for the adjoint or dual wave function ψ^* one writes in [51] $\psi^*L = -\partial_y\psi^*$ with $\psi^*A = \partial_t\psi^*$ where $\psi^*(f\partial^j) \equiv (-\partial)^j(\psi^*f)$. We modify the formulas used in [51] (and [40]) in taking

$$\psi = e^{px+Ey+\Omega t} \cdot \phi(Ux + Vy + Wt, P); \quad \psi^* = e^{-px-Ey-\Omega t} \cdot \phi^*(-Ux - Vy - Wt, P) \quad (3.1)$$

where $p = p(P)$, $E = E(P)$, $\Omega = \Omega(P)$, etc. (cf. (2.3) - (2.4)), which isolate the quantities needed in averaging. The arguments to follow are essentially the same for this choice of notation, or that in [40] or [51]. Now one sees immediately that

$$(\psi^*L)\psi = \psi^*L\psi + \partial_x(\psi^*L^1\psi) + \partial_x^2(\psi^*L^2\psi) + \dots \quad (3.2)$$

where e.g. $L^r = ((-1)^r/r!)(d^r L/d(\partial)^r)$. In particular

$$\psi_{xx}^* \psi = \psi^* \psi_{xx} - 2\partial(\psi^* \psi_x) + \partial^2(\psi^* \psi); \quad (3.3)$$

$$-\psi_{xxx}^* \psi = \psi^* \psi_{xxx} - \partial^3(\psi^* \psi) + 3[\partial^2(\psi^* \psi_x) - \partial(\psi^* \psi_{xx})]$$

This means $(L^* = L, \psi^* A \sim A^* \psi^* = -\partial^3 \psi^* + (3/2)\partial(\psi^* u) + w\psi^*)$

$$(\psi^* L)\psi = [(\partial^2 - u)\psi^*]\psi = \psi_{xx}^* \psi - u\psi^* \psi = \psi^* L\psi - 2\partial(\psi^* \psi_x) + \partial^2(\psi^* \psi) \quad (3.4)$$

which implies $L^1 = -2\partial$ and $L^2 = 1$. Next

$$\begin{aligned} (\psi^* A)\psi &= -\psi_{xxx}^* \psi + \frac{3}{2}(\psi_x^* u + \psi^* u_x)\psi + w\psi^* \psi = \psi^*(A\psi) + \\ &+ \partial[\psi^*(\frac{3}{2}u - 3\partial^2)\psi] + 3\partial^2(\psi^* \psi_x) - \partial^3(\psi^* \psi) \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

so that $A^1 = -3\partial^2 + (3/2)u$, $A^2 = 3\partial$, and $A^3 = -1$. We think of a general Riemann surface Σ_g . Here one picks holomorphic differentials $d\omega_k$ as before and quasi-momenta, quasi-energies, etc. via $dp \sim d\Omega_1$, $dE \sim d\Omega_2$, $d\Omega \sim d\Omega_3, \dots$ where $\lambda \sim k$, $p = \int_{P_0}^P d\Omega_1$, etc. Normalize the $d\Omega_k$ so that $\Re \int_{A_i} d\Omega_k = 0 = \Re \int_{B_j} d\Omega_k$ (cf. remarks after (2.4)); then $U, V, W, \dots$ are real $2g$ period vectors. and one has BA functions $\psi(x, y, t, P)$ as in (3.1). As before we look for approximations based on $u_0(xU + yV + tW|I) = u_o(\theta_j, I_k)$. For averaging, $\theta_j \sim xU_j + yV_j + tW_j$, $1 \leq j \leq 2g$, with period 2π in the θ_j seems natural (but note $\theta_j, \theta_{g+j} \sim U_j$, etc.). Then again by ergodicity $\langle \phi \rangle_x = \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} (1/2L) \int_{-L}^L \phi dx$ becomes $\langle \phi \rangle = (1/(2\pi)^{2g} \int \dots \int \phi d^{2g}\theta$ and one notes that $\langle \partial_x \phi \rangle = 0$ automatically for ϕ bounded. In [40] one thinks of $\phi(xU + \dots)$ with $\phi_x = \sum U_i(\partial\phi/\partial\theta_i)$ and $\int \dots \int (\partial\phi/\partial\theta_i) d^{2g}\theta = 0$.

Now for averaging we think of $u_0 \sim u_0(\frac{1}{\epsilon}S|I)$ as in (2.7) with $(\hat{S}, I) \sim (\hat{S}, I)(X, Y, T)$, $\partial_X \hat{S} = U$, $\partial_Y \hat{S} = V$, and $\partial_T \hat{S} = W$. We think of expanding about u_0 with $\partial_x \rightarrow \partial_x + \epsilon \partial_X$. This step will cover both x and X dependence for subsequent averaging. Then look at the compatibility condition ($\clubsuit$): $\partial_t L - \partial_y A + [L, A] = 0$. As before we will want the term of first order in ϵ upon writing e.g. $L = L_0 + \epsilon L_1 + \dots$ and $A = A_0 + \epsilon A_1 + \dots$ where slow variables appear only in the L_0, A_0 terms. As indicated in [51] the term $[L, A] \rightarrow \{L, A\}$ where $\{L, A\}$ arises upon replacing ∂_x be $\partial_x + \epsilon \partial_X$ in all the differential expressions and taking the terms of first order in ϵ . However the formula in [51] is somewhat unclear so we compute some factors explicitly. In fact, according to [40], one can write now, to make the coefficient of ϵ vanish

$$\partial_t L_1 - \partial_y A_1 + [L_0, A_1] + [L_1, A_0] + F = 0; \quad F = \partial_T L - \partial_Y A - (L^1 \partial_X A - A^1 \partial_X L) \quad (3.6)$$

Thus F is the first order term involving derivatives in the slow variables (note the $L^1 \partial_X A$ and $A^1 \partial_X L$ terms have opposite signs from [40, 51] but this seems to be correct). To clarify this let us write $(\hat{\partial} \sim \partial/\partial X)$ $L_\epsilon = (\partial + \epsilon \hat{\partial})^2 - (u_0 + \epsilon u_1 + \dots) = \partial^2 - u_0 + \epsilon(2\partial \hat{\partial} - u_1) + O(\epsilon^2)$ and $A_\epsilon = (\partial + \epsilon \hat{\partial})^3 - (3/2)(u_0 + \epsilon u_1 + \dots) \cdot (\partial + \epsilon \hat{\partial}) + w_0 + \epsilon w_1 + \dots = \partial^3 - (3/2)u_0 \partial + w_0 + \epsilon(3\partial^2 \hat{\partial} - (3/2)u_1 \partial - (3/2)u_0 \hat{\partial} + w_1) + O(\epsilon^2)$. Write then $A_\epsilon = A_0 + \hat{A}_1 \epsilon + O(\epsilon^2)$ and $L_\epsilon = L_0 + \hat{L}_1 \epsilon + O(\epsilon^2)$ with $\hat{A}_1 = 3\partial^2 \hat{\partial} - (3/2)u_1 \partial - (3/2)u_0 \hat{\partial} + w_1$ and $\hat{L}_1 = 2\partial \hat{\partial} - u_1$. Note that $L^1 = -2\partial \neq \hat{L}_1$ and $A^1 = -3\partial^2 + (3/2)u_0 \neq \hat{A}_1$ but we can write

$$\hat{A}_1 = -A^1 \hat{\partial} - (3/2)u_1 \partial + w_1 = -A^1 \hat{\partial} + A_1; \quad (3.7)$$

$$\hat{L}_1 = -L^1 \hat{\partial} - u_1 = -L^1 \hat{\partial} + L_1$$

with $L_1 = -u_1$ and $A_1 = -(3/2)u_1 \partial + w_1$ as in [40]. Then ($\clubsuit$) becomes

$$\partial_t L_0 - \partial_y A_0 + [L_0, A_0] + \epsilon \{ \partial_t L_1 - \partial_y A_1 + \partial_T L - \partial_Y A + [L_0, \hat{A}_1] + [\hat{L}_1, A_0] \} + O(\epsilon^2) \quad (3.8)$$

Now the $\partial_t L_0 - \partial_y A_0 + [L_0, A_0]$ term vanishes and we note that

$$\begin{aligned} [L_0, \hat{A}_1] + [\hat{L}_1, A_0] &= [L_0, -A^1 \hat{\partial}] + [-L^1 \hat{\partial}, A_0] + [L_0, A_1] + [L_1, A_0] = \\ &= [L_0, A_1] + [L_1, A_0] + A^1 \hat{\partial} L_0 - L^1 \hat{\partial} A_0 - L_0 A^1 \hat{\partial} + A_0 L^1 \hat{\partial} \end{aligned} \quad (3.9)$$

Then one notes that $\partial_X L_0 \sim \partial_X L$ and $\partial_X A_0 \sim \partial_X A$ ($\partial_X \sim \hat{\partial}$) so dropping the terms in (3.9) with an inoperative $\hat{\partial}$ on the right we obtain (3.6). Next one writes, using (3.2)

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t(\psi^* L_1 \psi) - \partial_y(\psi^* A_1 \psi) &= \psi^* \{ L_{1t} - A_{1y} + [L_1, A] + [L, A_1] \} \psi = \\ &= \psi^* (\partial_t L_1 - \partial_y A_1 + [L_0, A_1] + [L_1, A_0]) \psi + \partial_x(\dots) \end{aligned} \quad (3.10)$$

and via ergodicity in x, y , or t flows, averaging of derivatives in x, y , or t gives zero, so from (3.6) and (3.10) we obtain the Whitham equations in the form $\langle \psi^* F \psi \rangle = 0$ (this represents the first order term in ϵ - the slow variables are present in L_0, A_0, ψ , and ψ^*). In order to spell this out in [40] one imagines X, Y, T as a parameter ξ and considers $L(\xi), A(\xi)$, etc. (in their perturbed form) with

$$\psi(\xi) = e^{p(\xi)x + E(\xi)y + \Omega(\xi)t} \cdot \phi(U(\xi)x + V(\xi)y + W(\xi)t | I(\xi)) \quad (3.11)$$

where $\psi^* = \exp(-px - Ey - \Omega t) \phi^*(-Ux - Vy - Wt | I)$ (no ξ variation - i.e. assume p, E, Ω, U, V, W, I fixed). We recall that one expects $\lambda_k = \lambda_k(X, Y, T)$ etc. so the Riemann surface varies with ξ . Also recall that x, y, t and X, Y, T can be considered as independent variables. Now as above, using (3.2), we can write

$$\partial_t(\psi^* \psi(\xi)) = \psi^* (A(\xi) - A) \psi(\xi) - \partial_x(\psi^* A^1 \psi(\xi)) + \partial_x^2(\dots) \quad (3.12)$$

Note also from (3.11) for P fixed ($\theta \sim xU + yV + tW$)

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_\xi \psi^* \psi(\xi)|_{\xi=0} &= (\dot{p}x + \dot{E}y + \dot{\Omega}t) \psi^* \psi + \\ &+ (\dot{U}x + \dot{V}y + \dot{W}t) \cdot \psi^* \partial_\theta \psi + \dot{I} \cdot \psi^* \partial_I \psi \end{aligned} \quad (3.13)$$

where $\dot{f} \sim \partial f / \partial \xi$. In [40] one assumes that it is also permitted to vary ξ and hold e.g. the I_k constant while allowing say the P to vary. Now differentiate the left side $\partial_t(\psi^* \psi(\xi))$ of (3.12) in ξ and use (3.13) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_\xi [\partial_t(\psi^* \psi(\xi))]|_{\xi=0} &= \dot{\Omega} \psi^* \psi + \dot{W} \cdot \psi^* \psi_\theta + \\ &+ \{ (\dot{p}x + \dot{E}y + \dot{\Omega}t) \partial_t(\psi^* \psi) + (\dot{U}x + \dot{V}y + \dot{W}t) \cdot \partial_t(\psi^* \psi_\theta) + \dot{I} \cdot \partial_t(\psi^* \psi_I) \} \end{aligned} \quad (3.14)$$

Fixing x, y, t and averaging (3.14) in the θ variables yields

$$\langle \partial_\xi [\partial_t(\psi^* \psi(\xi))]|_{\xi=0} \rangle = \dot{\Omega} \langle \psi^* \psi \rangle + \dot{W} \langle \psi^* \psi_\theta \rangle \quad (3.15)$$

Next one differentiates the right side of (3.12) in ξ , averages in the θ variables for x, y, t fixed, and equates to (3.15), to obtain

$$(3.15) = \langle \psi^* \dot{A} \psi \rangle - \langle \partial_\xi [\partial_x(\psi^* A^1 \psi(\xi))]|_{\xi=0} \rangle = \quad (3.16)$$

$$< \psi^* \dot{A} \psi > - \dot{p} < \psi^* A^1 \psi > - \dot{U} \cdot < \psi^* A^1 \psi_\theta >$$

We note here as in (3.13) - (3.14) (one can disregard A^1 action on the isolated x term, and assumes I fixed, since only more terms $\partial_x(\dots)$ arise whose average vanishes)

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_x \partial_\xi (\psi^* A^1 \psi)|_{\xi=0} &= \partial_x [\psi^* A^1 (\dot{p}x + \dot{E}y + \dot{\Omega}t) \psi + \\ &+ \psi^* A^1 (\dot{U}x + \dot{V}y + \dot{W}t) \cdot \psi_\theta] = \dot{p} \psi^* A^1 \psi + \dot{U} \cdot \psi^* A^1 \psi_\theta + \\ &+ (\dot{p}x + \dot{E}y + \dot{\Omega}y) \partial_x (\psi^* A^1 \psi) + (\dot{U}x + \dot{V}y + \dot{W}t) \cdot \partial_x (\psi^* A^1 \psi_\theta) \end{aligned} \quad (3.17)$$

and (3.16) follows. Rewriting (3.16) with $\xi \sim Y$ we obtain (note $\psi^* \psi_\theta = \phi^* \phi_\theta$)

$$\begin{aligned} - < \psi^* \partial_Y A \psi > &= -\partial_Y \Omega < \psi^* \psi > - \partial_Y W < \phi^* \phi_\theta > - \\ &- \partial_Y p < \psi^* A^1 \psi > - \partial_Y U \cdot < \psi^* A^1 \psi_\theta > \end{aligned} \quad (3.18)$$

Similarly one uses (cf. (3.12))

$$\partial_y (\psi^* \psi(\xi)) = \psi^* (L(\xi) - L) \psi(\xi) - \partial_x (\psi^* L^1 \psi(\xi)) + \partial_x^2(\dots) \quad (3.19)$$

with $\xi \sim T$ to get

$$\begin{aligned} < \psi^* \partial_T L \psi > &= \partial_T E < \psi^* \psi > + \partial_T V \cdot < \phi^* \phi_\theta > + \\ &+ \partial_T p < \psi^* L^1 \psi > + \partial_T U \cdot < \psi^* L^1 \psi_\theta > \end{aligned} \quad (3.20)$$

Finally note that

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_y (\psi^* A^1 \psi(\xi)) - \partial_t (\psi^* L^1 \psi(\xi)) &= \\ = \psi^* [L^1(A(\xi) - A) - A^1(L(\xi) - L)] \psi(\xi) &+ \partial_x(\dots) \end{aligned} \quad (3.21)$$

Using this with $\xi \sim X$ one gets then as above

$$\begin{aligned} < \psi^* (L^1 \partial_X A - A^1 \partial_X L) \psi > &= \partial_X \Omega < \psi^* L^1 \psi > - \partial_X E < \psi^* A^1 \psi > + \\ &+ \partial_X W \cdot < \psi^* L^1 \psi_\theta > - \partial_X V \cdot < \psi^* A^1 \psi_\theta > \end{aligned} \quad (3.22)$$

This formula (3.22) will be of importance later in deciphering the notation of [58]. We recall that $\partial_X \hat{S} = U$, $\partial_Y \hat{S} = V$, and $\partial_T \hat{S} = W$ so there are compatibility relations

$$\partial_Y U = \partial_X V; \partial_T U = \partial_X W; \partial_T V = \partial_Y W \quad (3.23)$$

Now add up (3.18) and (3.20), and subtract (3.22) to get

$$\begin{aligned} < \psi^* [\partial_T L - \partial_Y A - L^1 \partial_X A + A^1 \partial_X L] \psi > &= < \psi^* F \psi > = 0 = \\ &= (\partial_T E - \partial_Y \Omega) < \psi^* \psi > + (\partial_T p - \partial_X \Omega) < \psi^* L^1 \psi > + (\partial_X E - \partial_Y p) < \psi^* A^1 \psi > \end{aligned} \quad (3.24)$$

We observe that if one lets the point P on Σ vary with ξ , while holding θ_k and I_j fixed, then

$$\partial_\xi (\psi^* \psi(\xi))|_{\xi=0} = (xdp + ydE + td\Omega) \phi^* \phi \quad (3.25)$$

which, together with (3.12) and (3.19), yields e.g.

$$d\Omega < \phi^* \phi > = -dp < \psi^* A^1 \psi >; dE < \phi^* \phi > = -dp < \psi^* L^1 \psi > \quad (3.26)$$

(cf. (3.16) - (3.17)). It follows then from (3.24) and (3.26) that

$$0 = (\Omega_Y - E_T)dp + (p_T - \Omega_X)dE + (E_X - p_Y)d\Omega \quad (3.27)$$

Thus one arrives at a version of the Whitham equations in the form

$$p_T = \Omega_X; \quad p_Y = E_X; \quad E_T = \Omega_Y \quad (3.28)$$

where the last equation establishes compatibility of the first two via $p_{TY} - p_{YT} = \Omega_{XY} - E_{XT} = \partial_X(\Omega_Y - E_T) = 0$. We feel that this derivation from [40], based on [51], is important since it again exhibits again the role of square eigenfunctions (now in the form $\psi^*\psi$) in dealing with averaging processes. In view of the geometrical nature of such square eigenfunctions (cf. [10] for example) one might look for underlying geometrical objects related to the results of averaging. Another (new) direction involves the Cauchy kernels expressed via $\psi^*\psi$ and their dispersionless limits (cf. [18]).

Let us write now ($\Upsilon \sim px + Ey + \Omega t$ and $\Xi = xU + yV + tW$) with

$$\begin{aligned} < \psi^* L^1 \psi > = < \psi^* (-2\partial) \psi > = -2 < e^{-\Upsilon} \phi^* [p e^{\Upsilon} \phi + U e^{\Upsilon} \phi_\theta] > = \\ & - 2[p < \phi^* \phi > + U < \phi^* \phi_\theta >] \end{aligned} \quad (3.29)$$

Similarly from $A^1 = -3\partial^2 + (3/2)u_0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} < \psi^* A^1 \psi > = -3 < \psi^* [p^2 e^{\Upsilon} \phi + 2pU e^{\Upsilon} \phi_\theta + U^2 e^{\Upsilon} \phi_{\theta\theta}] > + \\ + \frac{3}{2} < \psi^* u_0 \psi > = -3[p^2 < \phi^* \phi > + 2pU < \phi^* \phi_\theta > + U^2 < \phi^* \phi_{\theta\theta} >] + \frac{3}{2} < \phi^* u_0 \phi > \end{aligned} \quad (3.30)$$

We note also a natural comparison with (2.22) for the formula

$$< \psi \psi^* > = \sum_1^\infty \frac{< s_n >}{\lambda^n} \quad (3.31)$$

We remark here that such a series is natural from asymptotic expansions but when ψ , ψ^* are written in terms of theta functions it requires expansion of the theta functions in $1/\lambda$ (such expansions are documented in [27], p. 49 for example). It is now natural to ask whether one can express dp , dE , $d\Omega$ from (3.26) in more detail. Thus note first from (3.26)

$$\begin{aligned} dE < \phi^* \phi > &= 2dp[p < \phi^* \phi > + U < \phi^* \phi_\theta >]; \quad d\Omega < \phi^* \phi > = \\ 3dp[p^2 < \phi^* \phi > + 2pU < \phi^* \phi_\theta > + U^2 < \phi^* \phi_{\theta\theta} >] - \frac{3}{2}dp < \phi^* u_0 \phi > \end{aligned} \quad (3.32)$$

which says e.g.

$$\begin{aligned} dE &= 2pdp + \frac{2U < \phi^* \phi_\theta >}{< \phi^* \phi >} dp; \quad d\Omega = \\ &= 3p^2 dp + \left[6pU \frac{< \phi^* \phi_\theta >}{< \phi^* \phi >} + 3U^2 \frac{< \phi^* \phi_{\theta\theta} >}{< \phi^* \phi >} - \frac{3 < \phi^* u_0 \phi >}{2 < \phi^* \phi >} \right] dp \end{aligned} \quad (3.33)$$

Given $p \sim \lambda + \dots$, $E \sim \lambda^2 + \dots$, $\Omega \sim \lambda^3 + \dots$ this is reasonable. One would also like to compare (2.36) and the equation $\partial_T dp + \partial_X d\Omega + \partial_Y dE = 0$ (recall $\hat{\mathcal{L}} = (1/4)\partial^2 \gamma + 3\partial^{-1}(u_0 \partial \gamma)$ and $\hat{\mathcal{G}} = (3/4)\partial_y \partial^{-1} \gamma$). One expects $dp = d\lambda + \dots$, $dE = 2\lambda d\lambda + \dots$, and $d\Omega = 3\lambda^2 d\lambda + \dots$ so a formula like (3.31) has an order of magnitude compatibility with a possible asymptotic identification $dp \sim < \gamma > d\lambda$. Note

here the analogy with (2.22) etc. where $\langle \Psi \rangle \sim \langle \mathcal{T} \rangle$ with $\hat{\Omega}_1 \sim -\langle \mathcal{T} \rangle (d\mu/2\sqrt{\mu})$ (the $1/\sqrt{\mu}$ weight factor arises from KdV notation here, linked to a hyperelliptic Riemann surface); recall also $\langle \mathcal{X} \rangle$ is similarly connected to $\hat{\Omega}_2$. Let us assume the “ansatz” ($\clubsuit\clubsuit$): For some choice of standard homology basis and local coordinate, $dp \sim \langle \psi\psi^* \rangle d\lambda$ for large $|\lambda|$. We have seen that a variation on this is valid for KdV situations and via changes in homology and local coordinate it is reasonable in general. In fact it is generally true via

LEMMA 3.1. The ansatz ($\clubsuit\clubsuit$) is valid for KP situations.

Proof: We refer here to [10] for background and notation (cf. also [13] for dispersionless genus zero situations). We write $\partial = L + \sum_1^\infty \sigma_j^1 L^{-j}$ which implies $\partial\psi/\psi = \lambda + \sum_1^\infty \sigma_j^1 \lambda^{-j}$. (this is motivated by the proof of Lemma 2.1 in [7]). Then $(\log\psi)_x = \lambda + \sum_1^\infty \sigma_j^1 \lambda^{-j}$ and $(\log\psi)_x = p = \lambda + \sum_1^\infty \langle \sigma_j^1 \rangle \lambda^{-j}$. But $s_{n+1} = -n\sigma_n^1 - \sum_1^{n-1} \partial_j \sigma_{n-j}^1$ and one obtains $\langle s_{n+1} \rangle = -n \langle \sigma_n^1 \rangle - \sum_1^{n-1} \langle \partial_j \sigma_{n-j}^1 \rangle = -n \langle \sigma_n^1 \rangle$. Thus, $dp = d\lambda - \sum_1^\infty j \langle \sigma_j^1 \rangle \lambda^{-j-1} d\lambda = d\lambda + \sum_1^\infty \langle s_{j+1} \rangle \lambda^{-j-1} d\lambda = \langle \psi\psi^* \rangle$ since $\psi\psi^* = \sum_0^\infty s_n \lambda^{-n}$, and the normalization is built into this construction. **QED**

Similarly from (3.26) we obtain for large λ

$$d\Omega \sim -\langle \psi^* A^1 \psi \rangle d\lambda; dE \sim -\langle \psi^* L^1 \psi \rangle d\lambda \quad (3.34)$$

(note this requires $\langle \psi^* L^1 \psi \rangle = O(2\lambda)$ which by (3.29) is correct while $\langle \psi^* A^1 \psi \rangle$ should be $O(3\lambda^2)$ which is also correct). It is clear that $dp = \langle \psi^* \psi \rangle d\lambda$ cannot hold globally since $\langle \psi^* \psi \rangle$ should have poles at $D + D^*$ and the correct global statement follows from [51, 58], namely $(dp / \langle \psi^* \psi \rangle) = d\hat{\Omega}$ where $d\hat{\Omega}$ is the unique meromorphic differential with a double pole at ∞ and zeros at the poles of $\psi^* \psi$ (i.e. at $D + D^*$); this characterizes $d\hat{\Omega}$ and one can state

THEOREM 3.2. With the notations as above $dp = \langle \psi\psi^* \rangle d\hat{\Omega}$, $dE \sim -\langle \psi^* L^1 \psi \rangle d\hat{\Omega}$, and $d\Omega \sim -\langle \psi^* A^1 \psi \rangle d\hat{\Omega}$.

REMARK 3.3. From (2.36) one obtains now $\partial_T \langle \gamma \rangle = -\partial_X \langle \hat{\mathcal{L}} \rangle$. Further since $p_T = \Omega_X$ corresponds to $\partial_T dp = \partial_X d\Omega$ and $\partial_T dp \sim \partial_T \langle \gamma \rangle d\hat{\Omega}$ (note $d\hat{\Omega}$ will not depend on slow variables), one can formally write

$$-\partial_X \langle \hat{\mathcal{L}} \rangle \sim \partial_T \langle \gamma \rangle \sim \frac{\partial_T dp}{d\hat{\Omega}} \sim \frac{\partial_X d\Omega}{d\hat{\Omega}} \quad (3.35)$$

suggesting that

$$\langle \hat{\mathcal{L}} \rangle d\hat{\Omega} \sim -d\Omega \sim \langle \psi^* A^1 \psi \rangle d\hat{\Omega} \Rightarrow \langle \hat{\mathcal{L}} \rangle \sim \langle \psi^* A^1 \psi \rangle \quad (3.36)$$

This is consistent with (2.36) since

$$\partial_T \langle \gamma \rangle + \partial_X \langle \hat{\mathcal{L}} \rangle \sim \partial_T \left(\frac{dp}{d\hat{\Omega}} \right) - \partial_X \left(\frac{d\Omega}{d\hat{\Omega}} \right) = 0 \quad (3.37)$$

via $\partial_T dp = \partial_X d\Omega$.

In summary we can also state

THEOREM 3.4. The quantity $\psi\psi^*$ is seen to determine the Whitham hierarchy and the differentials dp , dE , $d\Omega$, etc.

REMARK 3.5. Since $D + D^* - 2\infty \sim K_\Sigma$, $\psi\psi^*$ is determined by a section of K_Σ (global point

of view) but it is relations based on $\langle \psi^* L^1 \psi \rangle$, $\langle \psi^* A^1 \psi \rangle$, etc. (based on the Krichever averaging process) which reveal the “guts” of $\psi\psi^*$ needed for averaging and the expression of differentials.

4 DISPERSIONLESS THEORY

4.1 General framework for KP

We give next a brief sketch of some ideas regarding dispersionless KP (dKP) following mainly [12, 13, 14, 41, 47, 74] to which we refer for philosophy. We will make various notational adjustments as we go along. One can think of fast and slow variables with $\epsilon x = X$ and $\epsilon t_n = T_n$ so that $\partial_n \rightarrow \epsilon \partial / \partial T_n$ and $u(x, t_n) \rightarrow \tilde{u}(X, T_n)$ to obtain from the KP equation $(1/4)u_{xxx} + 3uu_x + (3/4)\partial^{-1}\partial_2^2 u = 0$ the equation $\partial_T \tilde{u} = 3\tilde{u}\partial_X \tilde{u} + (3/4)\partial^{-1}(\partial^2 \tilde{u} / \partial T_2^2)$ when $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ ($\partial^{-1} \rightarrow (1/\epsilon)\partial^{-1}$). In terms of hierarchies the theory can be built around the pair (L, M) in the spirit of [10, 13, 74]. Thus writing (t_n) for (x, t_n) (i.e. $x \sim t_1$ here) consider

$$L_\epsilon = \epsilon \partial + \sum_1^\infty u_{n+1}(\epsilon, T)(\epsilon \partial)^{-n}; \quad M_\epsilon = \sum_1^\infty n T_n L_\epsilon^{n-1} + \sum_1^\infty v_{n+1}(\epsilon, T) L_\epsilon^{-n-1} \quad (4.1)$$

Here L is the Lax operator $L = \partial + \sum_1^\infty u_{n+1} \partial^{-n}$ and M is the Orlov-Schulman operator defined via $\psi_\lambda = M\psi$. Now one assumes $u_n(\epsilon, T) = U_n(T) + O(\epsilon)$, etc. and set (recall $L\psi = \lambda\psi$)

$$\begin{aligned} \psi &= \left[1 + O\left(\frac{1}{\lambda}\right) \right] \exp\left(\sum_1^\infty \frac{T_n}{\epsilon} \lambda^n\right) = \exp\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon} S(T, \lambda) + O(1)\right); \\ \tau &= \exp\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon^2} F(T) + O\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)\right) \end{aligned} \quad (4.2)$$

We recall that $\partial_n L = [B_n, L]$, $B_n = L_+^n$, $\partial_n M = [B_n, M]$, $[L, M] = 1$, $L\psi = \lambda\psi$, $\partial_\lambda \psi = M\psi$, and $\psi = \tau(T - (1/n\lambda^n)) \exp[\sum_1^\infty T_n \lambda^n] / \tau(T)$. Putting in the ϵ and using ∂_n for $\partial / \partial T_n$ now, with $P = S_X$, one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda &= P + \sum_1^\infty U_{n+1} P^{-n}; \quad P = \lambda - \sum_1^\infty P_i \lambda^{-1}; \\ \mathcal{M} &= \sum_1^\infty n T_n \lambda^{n-1} + \sum_1^\infty V_{n+1} \lambda^{-n-1}; \quad \partial_n S = \mathcal{B}_n(P) \Rightarrow \partial_n P = \hat{\partial} \mathcal{B}_n(P) \end{aligned} \quad (4.3)$$

where $\hat{\partial} \sim \partial_X + (\partial P / \partial X) \partial_P$ and $M \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$. Note that one assumes also $v_{i+1}(\epsilon, T) = V_{i+1}(T) + O(\epsilon)$; further for $B_n = \sum_0^n b_{nm} \partial^m$ one has $\mathcal{B}_n = \sum_0^n b_{nm} P^m$ (note also $B_n = L^n + \sum_1^\infty \sigma_j^n L^{-j}$). We list a few additional formulas which are easily obtained (cf. [13]); thus, writing $\{A, B\} = \partial_P A \partial A - \partial A \partial_P B$ one has

$$\partial_n \lambda = \{\mathcal{B}_n, \lambda\}; \quad \partial_n \mathcal{M} = \{\mathcal{B}_n, \mathcal{M}\}; \quad \{\lambda, \mathcal{M}\} = 1 \quad (4.4)$$

Now we can write $S = \sum_1^\infty T_n \lambda^n + \sum_1^\infty S_{j+1} \lambda^{-j}$ with $\partial_m S_{j+1} = \tilde{\sigma}_j^m$, $V_{n+1} = -n S_{n+1}$, and $\partial_\lambda S = \mathcal{M}$ ($\sigma_j^m \rightarrow \tilde{\sigma}_j^m$). Further

$$\mathcal{B}_n = \lambda^n + \sum_1^\infty \partial_n S_{j+1} \lambda^{-j}; \quad \partial S_{n+1} \sim -P_n \sim -\frac{\partial V_{n+1}}{n} \sim -\frac{\partial \partial_n F}{n} \quad (4.5)$$

We sketch next a few formulas from [47] (cf. also [49, 50]). First it will be important to rescale the T_n variables and write $t' = nt_n$, $T'_n = nT_n$, $\partial_n = n\partial'_n = n(\partial/\partial T'_n)$. Then

$$\partial'_n S = \frac{\lambda^n}{n}; \quad \partial'_n \lambda = \{\mathcal{Q}_n, \lambda\} \quad (\mathcal{Q}_n = \frac{\mathcal{B}_n}{n}); \quad (4.6)$$

$$\partial'_n P = \hat{\partial} \mathcal{Q}_n = \partial \mathcal{Q}_n + \partial_P \mathcal{Q}_n \partial P; \quad \partial'_n \mathcal{Q}_m - \partial'_m \mathcal{Q}_n = \{\mathcal{Q}_n, \mathcal{Q}_m\}$$

Now think of (P, X, T'_n) , $n \geq 2$, as basic Hamiltonian variables with $P = P(X, T'_n)$. Then $-\mathcal{Q}_n(P, X, T'_n)$ will serve as a Hamiltonian via

$$\dot{P}' = \frac{dP'}{dT'_n} = \partial \mathcal{Q}_n; \quad \dot{X}' = \frac{dX}{dT'_n} = -\partial_P \mathcal{Q}_n \quad (4.7)$$

(recall the classical theory for variables (q, p) involves $\dot{q} = \partial H/\partial p$ and $\dot{p} = -\partial H/\partial q$). The function $S(\lambda, X, T_n)$ plays the role of part of a generating function $\tilde{S}$ for the Hamilton-Jacobi theory with action angle variables $(\lambda, -\xi)$ where

$$PdX + \mathcal{Q}_n dT'_n = -\xi d\lambda - K_n dT'_n + d\tilde{S}; \quad K_n = -R_n = -\frac{\lambda^n}{n}; \quad (4.8)$$

$$\frac{d\lambda}{dT'_n} = \dot{\lambda}'_n = \partial_\xi R_n = 0; \quad \frac{d\xi}{dT'_n} = \dot{\xi}'_n = -\partial_\lambda R_n = -\lambda^{n-1}$$

(note that $\dot{\lambda}'_n = 0 \sim \partial'_n \lambda = \{\mathcal{Q}_n, \lambda\}$). To see how all this fits together we write

$$\frac{dP}{dT'_n} = \partial'_n P + \frac{\partial P}{\partial X} \frac{dX}{dT'_n} = \hat{\partial} \mathcal{Q}_n + \frac{\partial P}{\partial X} \dot{X}' = \partial \mathcal{Q}_n + \partial_P \mathcal{Q}_n \partial P + \partial P \dot{X}' \quad (4.9)$$

This is compatible with (4.7) and Hamiltonians $-\mathcal{Q}_n$. Furthermore one wants

$$\tilde{S}_\lambda = \xi; \quad \tilde{S}_X = P; \quad \partial'_n \tilde{S} = \mathcal{Q}_n - R_n \quad (4.10)$$

and from (4.8) one has

$$PdX + \mathcal{Q}_n dT'_n = -\xi d\lambda + R_n dT'_n + \tilde{S}_X dX + \tilde{S}_\lambda d\lambda + \partial'_n \tilde{S} dT'_n \quad (4.11)$$

which checks. We note that $\partial'_n S = \mathcal{Q}_n = \mathcal{B}_n/n$ and $S_X = P$ by constructions and definitions. Consider $\tilde{S} = S - \sum_2^\infty \lambda^n T'_n/n$. Then $\tilde{S}_X = S_X = P$ and $\tilde{S}'_n = S'_n - R_n = \mathcal{Q}_n - R_n$ as desired with $\xi = \tilde{S}_\lambda = S_\lambda - \sum_2^\infty T'_n \lambda^{n-1}$. It follows that $\xi \sim \mathcal{M} - \sum_2^\infty T'_n \lambda^{n-1} = X + \sum_1^\infty V_{i+1} \lambda^{-i-1}$. If W is the gauge operator such that $L = W \partial W^{-1}$ one sees easily that

$$M\psi = W \left(\sum_1^\infty kx_k \partial^{k-1} \right) W^{-1} \psi = \left(G + \sum_2^\infty kx_k \lambda^{k-1} \right) \psi \quad (4.12)$$

from which follows that $G = WxW^{-1} \rightarrow \xi$. This shows that G is a very fundamental object and this is encountered in various places in the general theory (cf. [10, 13, ?, 79]).

REMARK 4.1. We refer here also to [12, 14] for a complete characterization of dKP and the solution of the dispersionless Hirota equations.

4.2 Dispersionless theory for KdV

We give a special treatment here for KdV since it is needed in [17, 20]. Thus following [9, 11, 13, 25] we write

$$L^2 = L_+^2 = \partial^2 + q = \partial^2 - u \quad (q = -u = 2u_2); \quad q_t - 6qq_x - q_{xxx} = 0; \quad (4.13)$$

$$B = 4\partial^3 + 6q\partial + 3q_x; \quad L_t^2 = [B, L^2]; \quad q = -v^2 - v_x \sim v_t + 6v^2v_x + v_{xxx} = 0$$

(v satisfies the mKdV equation). KdV is Galilean invariant ($x' = x - 6\lambda t$, $t' = t$, $u' = u + \lambda$) and consequently one can consider $L + \partial^2 + q - \lambda = (\partial + v)(\partial - v)$, $q - \lambda = -v_x - v^2$, $v = \psi_x/\psi$, and $-\psi_{xx}/\psi = q - \lambda$ or $\psi_{xx} + q\psi = \lambda\psi$ (with $u' = u + \lambda \sim q' = q - \lambda$). The v equation in (4.13) becomes then $v_t = \partial(-6\lambda v + 2v^3 - v_{xx})$ and for $\lambda = -k^2$ one expands for $\Im k > 0$, $|k| \rightarrow \infty$ to get (••) $v \sim ik + \sum_1^\infty (v_n/(ik)^n)$. The v_n are conserved densities and with $2 - \lambda = -v_x - v^2$ one obtains

$$p = -2v_1; \quad 2v_{n+1} = -\sum_1^{n-1} v_{n-m}v_m - v'_n; \quad 2v_2 = -v'_1 \quad (4.14)$$

Next for $\psi'' - u\psi = -k^2\psi$ write $\psi_\pm \sim \exp(\pm ikx)$ as $x \rightarrow \pm\infty$. Recall also the transmission and reflection coefficient formulas (cf. [9]) $T(k)\psi_- = R(k)\psi_+ + \psi_+(-k, x)$ and $T\psi_+ = R_L\psi_- + \psi_-(-k, x)$. Writing e.g. $\psi_+ = \exp(ikx + \phi(k, x))$ with $\phi(k, \infty) = 0$ one has $\phi'' + 2ik\phi' + (\phi')^2 = u$. Then $\psi'_+/ \psi_+ = ik + \phi' = v$ with $q - \lambda = -v_x - v^2$. Take then

$$\phi' = \sum_1^\infty \frac{\phi_n}{(2ik)^n}; \quad v \sim ik + \phi' = ik + \sum \frac{v_n}{(ik)^n} \Rightarrow \phi_n = 2^n v_n \quad (4.15)$$

Furthermore one knows (cf. [9])

$$\log T = -\sum_0^\infty \frac{c_{2n+1}}{k^{2n+1}}; \quad c_{2n+1} = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{-\infty}^\infty k^{2n} \log(1 - |R|^2) dk \quad (4.16)$$

(assuming for convenience that there are no bound states). Now for $c_{22} = R_L/T$ and $c_{21} = 1/T$ one has as $k \rightarrow -\infty$ ($\Im k > 0$) the behavior $\psi_+ \exp(-ikx) \rightarrow c_{22} \exp(-2ikx) + c_{21} \rightarrow c_{21}$. Hence $\exp(\phi) \rightarrow c_{21}$ as $x \rightarrow -\infty$ or $\phi(k, -\infty) = -\log T$ which implies

$$\int_{-\infty}^\infty \phi' dx = \log T = \sum_1^\infty \int_{-\infty}^\infty \frac{\phi_n dx}{(2ik)^n} \quad (4.17)$$

Hence $\int \phi_{2m} dx = 0$ and $c_{2m+1} = -\int \phi_{2m+1} dx / (2i)^{2m+1}$. The c_{2n+1} are related to Hamiltonians $H_{2n+1} = \alpha_n c_{2n+1}$ as in [10, 11] and thus the conserved densities $v_n \sim \phi_n$ give rise to Hamiltonians H_n (n odd). There are action angle variables $P = k \log|T|$ and $Q = \gamma \arg(R_L/T)$ with Poisson structure $\{F, G\} \sim \int (\delta F / \delta u) \partial(\delta G / \delta u) dx$ (we omit the second Poisson structure here).

Now look at the dispersionless theory based on k where $\lambda \sim (ik)^2 = -k^2$. One obtains for $P = S_X$, $P^2 + q = -k^2$, and we write $\mathcal{P} = (1/2)P^2 + p = (1/2)(ik)^2$ with $q \sim 2p \sim 2u_2$. One has $\partial k / \partial T_{2n} = \{(ik)^{2n}, k\} = 0$ and from $ik = P(1 + qP^{-2})^{1/2}$ we obtain

$$ik = P \left(1 + \sum_1^\infty \binom{\frac{1}{2}}{m} q^m P^{-2m} \right) \quad (4.18)$$

(cf. (4.3) with $u_2 = q/2$). The flow equations become then

$$\partial'_{2n+1}P = \hat{\partial}\mathcal{Q}_{2n+1}; \quad \partial'_{2n+1}(ik) = \{\mathcal{Q}_{2n+1}, ik\} \quad (4.19)$$

Note here some rescaling is needed since we want $(\partial^2 + q)_+^{3/2}\partial^3 + (3/2)q\partial + (3/4)q_x = B_3$ instead of our previous $B_3 \sim 4\partial^3 + 6q\partial + 3q_x$. Thus we want $\mathcal{Q}_3 = (1/3)P^3 + (1/2)qP$ to fit the earlier notation. The Gelfand-Dickey resolvent coefficients are defined via $R_s(u) = (1/2)Res(\partial^2 - u)^{s-(1/2)}$ and in the dispersionless picture $R_s(u) \rightarrow (1/2)r_{s-1}(-u/2)$ (cf. [13]) where

$$r_n = Res(-k^2)^{n+(1/2)} = \binom{n+(1/2)}{n+1} q^{n+1} = \frac{(n+1/2) \cdots (1/2)}{(n+1)!} q^{n+1};$$

$$2\partial_q r_n = (2n+1)r_{n-1} \quad (4.20)$$

The inversion formula corresponding to (4.3) is $P = ik - \sum_1^\infty P_j(ik)^{-j}$ and one can write

$$\partial'_{2n+1}(P^2 + q) = \partial'_{2n+1}(-k^2); \quad \partial'_{2n+1}q = \frac{2}{2n+1}\partial r_n = \frac{2}{2n+1}\partial_q r_n q_X = q_X r_{n-1} \quad (4.21)$$

Note for example $r_0 = q/2$, $r_1 = 3q^2/8$, $r_2 = 5q^3/16, \dots$ and $\partial'_T q = q_X r_0 = (1/2)qq_X$ (scaling is needed in (4.13) here for comparison). Some further calculation gives for $P = ik - \sum_1^\infty P_n(ik)^{-n}$

$$P_n \sim -v_n \sim -\frac{\phi_n}{2^n}; \quad c_{2n+1} = (-1)^{n+1} \int_{-\infty}^\infty P_{2n+1}(X) dX \quad (4.22)$$

The development above actually gives a connection between inverse scattering and the dKdV theory (cf. [12, 13, 14] for more on this).

5 WHITHAM EQUATIONS AND SYMPLECTIC FORMS

5.1 General relations

In [53, 56, 57, 58] there is a development of Whitham theory and symplectic forms in a general context (cf. also [15, 16, 17, 20, 22, 31, 32, 33]). The idea is to have a universal Whitham hierarchy based on a space $\hat{M}_{gN}$ of smooth algebraic curves Σ_g with N punctures P_α , $\alpha = 1, \dots, N$, and local coordinates $k_\alpha^{-1}(P)$ (here P is a point on Σ_g). For each such datum and a set of g points $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_g \in \Sigma_g$ in general position (or equivalently a point in the Jacobian $J(\Sigma_g)$) standard algebro-geometric constructions give a quasiperiodic solution of some integrable nonlinear PDE. For KP one has $N = 1$ and for Toda $N = 2$; we concentrate here on $N = 1$. Note that P is used to represent a point on Σ_g (corresponding to $P = S_X$ in dispersionless theory), with $dp = d\Omega_1$ and $p(P) = \int^P dp$. From now on we will be scrupulous in distinguishing $d\Omega_i$ and $\Omega_i = \int^P d\Omega_i$. In [53, 56] one uses k_1^{-1} as a local coordinate at ∞ and we will think here of $k_1 \sim k \sim \lambda$ where λ corresponds to the “spectral” variable for KP (which in dKP becomes an action variable). Further $p(k, T)$ is specified as $\Omega_1(k, T)$ so k and P both represent points on Σ_g . Thus one must be careful in interpreting $P = S_X$ from dKP when working on Σ_g . In fact the $\hat{S}$ of (2.7) satisfies $\hat{S}_X = U$ as indicated before (3.6) and we will see below that there will be an action term $\mathcal{S}(p) = \sum T_i \Omega_i(p)$ with $\partial_i \mathcal{S} = \Omega_i$. Hence for $\Omega_1 = p$ one has $\partial_X \mathcal{S} = p$ and this plays the role of $P = S_X$ (from dispersionless theory) on Σ_g . Thus, for simplicity, in what follows $P \in \Sigma_g$, $k \sim P_1 \sim \infty$ with no other punctures, and $p \sim \Omega_1$.

Now in [53, 56] one relates the Whitham equations ($\spadesuit\spadesuit$) $\partial_i \Omega_j = \partial_j \Omega_i$ ($\partial_i \sim \partial/\partial T_i$), where the Ω_i are expressed in suitable variables as indicated below, to zero curvature equations

$$\partial_A \Omega_B - \partial_B \Omega_A + \{\Omega_A, \Omega_B\} = 0; \{f, g\} = f_X g_p - f_p g_X \quad (5.1)$$

(note the order of terms in $\{f, g\}$ is different from (2.3)). Here the A, B correspond to $(1, i)$, $1 \sim P_1$, and $i \sim \Omega_i$ where one thinks of $k = k(p, T)$ or $p = p(k, T)$ with $T_1 = X$, $\Omega_A = \Omega_A(p, T)$, and

$$\Omega_i = \int^{P \sim k} d\Omega_i = k^i + O(k^{-1}); k^i(p) = \sum_1^i w_{is} p^s \quad (5.2)$$

The analogy here is to $\mathcal{B}_i$ of (4.5) for example where

$$\mathcal{B}_n = \lambda_+^n = \lambda^n - \sum_1^\infty \frac{F_{nm}}{m} \lambda^{-m} = \sum_0^n b_{nm} P^m \quad (5.3)$$

Note that $b_{n0} \neq 0$ is possible however and recall that some normalization ($\oint_{A_j} d\Omega_i = 0$ for example) will hold; in any case the development is parallel. Now if E is an arbitrary function of (p, T) one can regard (5.1) as compatibility conditions for

$$\partial_A E = \{E, \Omega_A\} \quad (5.4)$$

(easy exercise, using the Jacobi identity) and this places one in the context of what are called algebraic solutions (when there is a global solution of (5.4). Here global means that E is a meromorphic solution of (5.4) such that $\{E(p, T), k(p, T)\} = 0$ so there exists $f(E)$ with $k(p, T) = f(E(p, T))$ (note then $\{E, k\}$ becomes $E_X f' E_p - E_p f' E_X = 0$). Generally one will stipulate that dE be a normalized meromorphic differential of the second kind. When $\partial_p E \neq 0$ one can write $p = p(E, T)$ and $\partial_A f(p, T) = \partial_A F(E, T) + (\partial F/\partial E) \partial_A E$ ($F(E, T) = f(p, T)$). Then for such an E (5.1) becomes

$$\partial_A \Omega_B(E, T) = \partial_B \Omega_A(E, T) \quad (5.5)$$

corresponding to ($\spadesuit\spadesuit$). Indeed we note that $(\Omega'_A \sim (\partial \Omega_A/\partial E), E' \sim (\partial E/\partial p))$

$$(5.1) = \partial_A \Omega_B + \Omega'_B E_A - \partial_B \Omega_A - \Omega'_A E_B + (\partial_X \Omega_A + \Omega'_A E_X) \Omega'_B E' - \quad (5.6)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & -\Omega'_A E' (\partial_X \Omega_B + \Omega'_B E_X) = \partial_A \Omega_B - \partial_B \Omega_A + \\ & + \Omega'_B (E_A + E' \partial_X \Omega_A) - \Omega'_A (E_B + E' \partial_X \Omega_B) = 0 \end{aligned}$$

But (5.4) implies for example that $E_A = E_X \partial_p \Omega_A(p, T) - E' \partial_X \Omega_A(p, T) = E_X \Omega'_A E' - E' (\partial_X \Omega_A(E, T) + \Omega'_A E_X) = -E' \partial_X \Omega_A \Rightarrow E_A + E' \partial_X \Omega_A(E, T) = 0$. Similarly $E_B + E' \partial_X \Omega_B(E, T) = 0$ and (5.6) implies (5.5). Thence, via (5.5), in coordinates E, T we can introduce a “potential” $\mathcal{S}(E, T)$ such that

$$\Omega_A(E, T) = \partial_A \mathcal{S}(E, T) \quad (5.7)$$

and define

$$\omega = \sum \Omega_A dT_A \quad (5.8)$$

(note this $\mathcal{S}$ is not a priori related to the $\hat{S}$ of (2.7)). Then for $Q = \partial \mathcal{S}/\partial E$ and $\delta \sim$ full exterior derivative

$$\delta \mathcal{S}(E, T) - Q dE = \partial_E \mathcal{S} dE + \sum \partial_A \mathcal{S} dT_A - Q dE = \sum \Omega_A dT_A = \omega \quad (5.9)$$

(note also that $p = \partial\mathcal{S}/\partial X = \Omega_1$). It follows that $\delta\omega = \sum \delta\Omega_A \wedge dT_A$ formally. Note that we are treating here dE and dT_A as independent objects and in this spirit from $\partial_A\mathcal{S} = \Omega_A$ and $d\mathcal{S} = QdE$ one obtains $d\Omega_A = d(\partial_A\mathcal{S}) = \partial_A(QdE) = (\partial_A Q)dE$ so that

$$\partial_A Q = \frac{d\Omega_A}{dE}; \quad \partial_X Q = \frac{dp}{dE} \quad (5.10)$$

(thus $\partial_A dE = 0$ in this context - i.e. $\partial_A dE \neq d(\partial_A E)$). In the same spirit from $\omega = \sum \partial_A \mathcal{S} dT_A = \delta\mathcal{S} - \mathcal{S}_E dE = \delta\mathcal{S} - QdE$ we get

$$\delta\omega = \delta^2\mathcal{S} - \delta Q \wedge dE = dE \wedge \delta Q \quad (5.11)$$

This is set equal to $\delta E \wedge \delta Q$ in [53, 56] but this seems incorrect unless other assumptions are made, so a justification follows. Thus first for a more complete discussion of related manipulation we refer to [74] where ($S \sim \mathcal{S}$ generically now)

$$\mathcal{M} = \partial_\lambda \mathcal{S} \sim Q = \partial_E \mathcal{S}; \quad \mathcal{B}_n = \partial_n \mathcal{S} \sim \Omega_A = \partial_A \mathcal{S}; \quad (5.12)$$

$$d\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{M}d\lambda + \sum \mathcal{B}_n dT_n \sim \delta\mathcal{S} = QdE + \sum \Omega_A dT_A$$

We note next that, using (5.10) and $\partial_A f = \partial_A F + F_E \partial_A E$ before (5.5),

$$\begin{aligned} \{Q(p, T), E(p, T)\} &= \partial_X Q \partial_p E - \partial_p Q \partial_X E = \\ &= (\partial_X Q(E, T) + Q_E E_X) E_p - Q_E E_p E_X = Q_X E_p = \frac{dp}{dE} \frac{dE}{dp} = 1 \end{aligned} \quad (5.13)$$

(analogous to $\{\lambda, \mathcal{M}\} = 1$ in [74], where $\{\lambda, \mathcal{M}\} = \lambda_P \mathcal{M}_X - \lambda_X \mathcal{M}_P$). Further note from $\{Q, E\} = 1$, $\partial_A E = \{E, \Omega_A\}$, and the Jacobi identity one has

$$\begin{aligned} \{\partial_A Q, E\} + \{Q, \partial_A E\} &= 0 \Rightarrow \{\partial_A Q, E\} + \{\{E, \Omega_A\}, Q\} = \\ &= \{\partial_A Q, E\} - \{\{Q, \Omega_A\}, E\} \end{aligned} \quad (5.14)$$

since $\{\{Q, E\}, \Omega_A\} = 0$. Then from $\{f, E\} = 0$ one gets $f_X E_p - f_p E_X = 0$ so for $f(p, T) = F(E, T)$ one has $(F_X + F_E E_X) E_p - F_E E_p E_X = F_X E_p = 0$ ($F \sim \partial_A Q - \{Q, \Omega_A\}$ here). Thus up to functions of T_n , $n > 1$ there results

$$\partial_A Q = \{Q, \Omega_A\} \quad (5.15)$$

which is not quite satisfactory. A better approach follows from [74]. Thus if we assume $\delta\omega = \delta E \wedge \delta Q$ one can write out $\delta\omega = \delta E \wedge \delta Q = \sum \delta\Omega_A \wedge dT_A$ to get

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_A (\partial_p \Omega_A dp + \sum_B \partial_B \Omega_A dT_B) \wedge dT_A &= \\ &= (E_p dp + \sum_C \partial_C E dT_C) \wedge (Q_p dp + \sum_D \partial_D Q dT_D) \end{aligned} \quad (5.16)$$

The coefficients of $dp \wedge dT_A$ and $dX \wedge dT_A$ are then

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_p \Omega_A &= E_p \partial_A Q - Q_p \partial_A E; \\ \partial_X \Omega_A &= \partial_X E \partial_A Q - \partial_A E \partial_X Q \end{aligned} \quad (5.17)$$

Solving for $\partial_A Q$ gives (5.15). Hence if we stipulate that (5.15) holds then $\delta\omega = \delta E \wedge \delta Q$ is permitted in (5.11).

5.2 Times, coordinates, and differentials

Another step needing further consideration is the construction $\mathcal{S}(p, T) = \int^p Q(p, T) dE(p, T)$ or $\mathcal{S}(p, T) = \sum (T_A - T_A^0) \Omega_A(p, T)$. This works for the genus zero situation with $\partial_A \mathcal{S} = \Omega_A$ (but this last formula needs proving - cf. [56] for a “proof” when $E \sim \lambda^n = \lambda_+^n$, $\lambda \sim k$). We remark also that for any formal power series $Q(p) = \sum_1^\infty b_j p^j$ one can define times $\hat{T}_i$ via

$$\hat{T}_i = \frac{1}{i} \text{Res}_{p=\infty} k^{-i}(p) Q(p) dE(p) \quad (5.18)$$

Thus for $Q \sim (d\mathcal{S}/dE)$ with $\mathcal{S}(p) = \sum_1^\infty T_i \Omega_i \sim \sum_1^\infty T_i k^i + O(k^{-1})$ one has

$$\hat{T}_i = \frac{1}{i} \text{Res}_{k=\infty} k^{-i} d\mathcal{S} = \frac{1}{i} \text{Res}_{k=\infty} \sum_1^\infty j T_j k^{j-i-1} = T_i \quad (5.19)$$

For the general situation without additional punctures we will describe matters as in [16] following [58] (cf. also [31, 32, 53, 56]). Thus take e.g.

$$E = p^n + u_{n-2} p^{n-2} + \cdots + u_0 + O(p^{-1}) \text{ or } E \sim k^n + O(k^{-1}) \quad (5.20)$$

This includes $E \sim \lambda_+^n$ or $E \sim \lambda^n$ or $dE \sim d\Omega_n$ (when normalized). For Whitham equations we will want normalization such as $\oint_{A_i} dE = 0$ but a larger theory can also be envisioned as in [58]. Let us think of $\Re \oint_{A_i} d\Omega_n = 0 = \Re \oint_{B_i} d\Omega_n$ here. Similarly take

$$dQ = d(k^m + O(k^{-1})) \quad (5.21)$$

so $dQ \sim d\Omega_m$ is appropriate when normalized. If the dE and dQ are not normalized there are g free parameters for each, corresponding to the holomorphic differentials which can be added without affecting asymptotic behavior. Look at the configuration space $\mathcal{M}_g(n, m) = \{\Sigma_g, P_1 \sim \infty, [k]_n, [k]_m, E, Q\}$. Note that an n -jet of coordinates $\sum_0^n k^j a_j$ is an equivalence class via $k' = k + O(k^{-n-1})$ and we will specify e.g. $Q = \sum_{-\infty}^m c_j k^j$ with no logarithmic term; the corresponding jet $[k]_m$ is then determined by $m+1$ coefficients $c_0, \dots, c_m$ plus g parameters for the holomorphic differentials which could be added without modifying the asymptotics. Hence in $\mathcal{M}_g(n, m)$ we will have $3g - 3 + 1$ parameters (for the moduli space of Riemann surfaces with genus g with one puncture), plus $n + m + 2 + 2g$ parameters for E, Q ; hence there are $5g + n + m$ parameters involved in specifying $\mathcal{M}_g(n, m)$. This number will be matched by $5g + n + m$ “times”

$$T_j = \frac{1}{j} \text{Res}_\infty (k^{-j} Q dE), \quad (j = 1, \dots, n+m); \quad \tau_{A_i, E} = \oint_{A_i} dE; \quad (5.22)$$

$$\tau_{B_i, E} = \oint_{B_i} dE; \quad \tau_{A_i, Q} = \oint_{A_i} dQ; \quad \tau_{B_i, Q} = \oint_{B_i} dQ; \quad a_i = \oint_{A_i} Q dE$$

where $i = 1, \dots, g$.

Now let $\mathcal{D}$ be the open set in $\mathcal{M}_g(n, m)$ where the zero divisors of dE and dQ do not intersect (i.e. the sets $\{\gamma; dE(\gamma) = 0\}$ and $\{\gamma; dQ(\gamma) = 0\}$ do not intersect). It is proved in [58] that near each point in $\mathcal{D}$ the $5g + n + m$ functions $T_k, \tau_{A_i, E}, \tau_{B_i, E}, \tau_{A_i, Q}, \tau_{B_i, Q}, a_i$ have linearly independent differentials, and thus define a local holomorphic coordinate system. Further the joint level sets of these functions (omitting the a_i) define a smooth g -dimensional foliation of $\mathcal{D}$, independent of the choices made in defining the coordinates themselves. Then $\mathcal{M}_g = \mathcal{M}_g(n, m)$ can be taken as a base

space for two fibrations $\mathcal{N}^g$ and $\mathcal{N}$; $\mathcal{N}^g$ has fiber $S^g(\Sigma) \simeq J(\Sigma) = \text{Jacobian variety}$ (via the Abel map $(\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_g) \rightarrow \sum_{i=1}^g \int_P^{\gamma_i} d\omega_j$) and $\mathcal{N}$ has fiber Σ (all over a point $(\Sigma, P, [k]_n, [k]_m E, Q) \in \mathcal{M}_g$). We consider only leaves $\mathcal{M}$ of the foliation of $\mathcal{D}$ indicated above and look at the fibration $\mathcal{N}$ or $\mathcal{N}^g$ over the base $\mathcal{M}$. First, although E and Q are multivalued on the universal fibration their differentials are well defined on $\mathcal{N}$. The idea here is that E and Q are well defined near P_1 and their analytic continuations by different paths can only change by multiples of their residues or periods along closed cycles. But on a leaf of the foliation the ambiguities remain constant and disappear upon differentiation. Hence one has differentials δE and δQ on the fibrations which reduce to dE and dQ acting on vectors tangent to the fiber. One can trivialize the fibration $\mathcal{N}$ with the variables $a_1, \dots, a_g$ along the leaf $\mathcal{M}$ and e.g. E along the fiber. Then dQ coincides with $(dQ/dE)dE$ where dE is viewed as one of the elements of the basis of one forms for $\mathcal{N}$ and the full differential is $\delta Q = dQ + \sum_1^g (\partial Q / \partial a_i) da_i \equiv dQ + \delta^E Q$ (also one can take here the constant terms in E, Q to be zero). This framework, with $QdE = pdE \sim \lambda_{SW} \sim \text{Seiberg-Witten (SW) differential}$ for example leads to a symplectic form $\omega_{\mathcal{M}} = \sum da_i \wedge d\omega_i$ for $\mathcal{N}^g$ which can be written in various interesting ways (cf. [16, 17, 58] and see also [6, 8, 24, 34, 44, 46, 58, 63, 64, 68, 70, 71, 75]); the constructions appear in Section 5.2.

In terms of Whitham theory we have differentials $d\Omega_j = d(k^j + O(k^{-1}))$ normalized as before which are coupled to the T_j plus holomorphic differentials $d\omega_j$ ($j = 1, \dots, g$) with $\oint_{A_i} d\omega_j = \delta_{ij}$ coupled to the a_j . In addition there are differentials $d\Omega_{E,i}$ and $d\Omega_{Q,i}$, holomorphic on Σ_g except for the A_j cycles, where they have jumps

$$d\Omega_{E,i}^+ - d\Omega_{E,i}^- = \delta_{ij} dE; \quad d\Omega_{Q,i}^+ - d\Omega_{Q,i}^- = \delta_{ij} dQ \quad (5.23)$$

with normalization conditions

$$\oint_{A_i} d\Omega_{E,j} = \oint_{A_i} d\Omega_{Q,j} = 0 \quad (5.24)$$

These are associated to $\tau_{B_i,E}$ and $\tau_{B_i,Q}$ and we note that for the Whitham theory the times $\tau_{A_i,E}$ and $\tau_{A_i,Q}$ vanish by normalization of dE and dQ . At this point the most elegant construction of an action differential is in [44] for Seiberg-Witten (SW) theory. The construction there is for a Toda theory on a hyperelliptic curve with differentials $d\Omega_{\pm m}$ but the arguments should be adaptable to the finite zone KP framework (see [16] for a condensed version of this argument in [44]). Indeed the moduli in [44] are treated abstractly (they could be Casimirs for example) and no branch points are involved. Then for the complete theory to apply it is only required that the number K of moduli h_k correspond to the genus g . Evidently this does not happen generally and in the context above one would look at level sets of the times T_j , $\tau_{B_i,E}$, $\tau_{B_i,Q}$, $\tau_{A_i,E}$, and $\tau_{A_i,Q}$, leaving only g variable “times” a_i . In the SW theory many situations (e.g. $SU(n)$ susy Yang-Mills) involve constructions of curves via flat moduli h_k with $K = g$. In such situations in [44] one constructs by elegant and subtle arguments

$$dS(h_k, T) = \sum_1^g a_i d\omega_i + \sum T_n d\Omega_n \quad (5.25)$$

such that $a_i = \oint_{A_i} dS$ with

$$\frac{\partial dS}{\partial T_n} = d\Omega_n; \quad \frac{\partial dS}{\partial a_i} = d\omega_i \quad (5.26)$$

There are then dual variables $a_i^D = \oint_{B_i} dS$ and a prepotential $\mathcal{F}$ such that

$$a_i^D = \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial a_i} \quad (5.27)$$

For the introduction of “times” a_i in BA functions etc. we refer to [68]; this will be spelled out later.

In the Whitham theory sketched above we have indicated the nice features of an $\mathcal{S}$ such that $Q = \partial_E \mathcal{S}$ but the construction of $\mathcal{S}$ with $\partial_n \mathcal{S} = \Omega_n$ was left unfinished. We refer to [44, 68] and the discussion of this in Section 6 for a more rigorous picture but will sketch here a few useful constructions from [53, 56, 58] for some perspective. For the dispersionless theory there is of course no problem (cf. Section 4 and [3, 12, 13, 14, 74]). In [53, 56] a number of theorems are stated (mostly without proof) and we will cite a few of these. Thus working on the subspace D of $N = \{\Sigma_g, E, [k]_n, Q, [k]_m\}$ where dQ and dE have no common zeros one states in [53] that the map $D \rightarrow T = \{T_A\}$, with T_A defined by (5.22) (without $\tau_{A_i, Q}$ or $\tau_{A_i, E}$), is nondegenerate, so that the T_A determine a coordinate system on D . The corresponding dependence of the curve $\Sigma_g(T)$ and $dE(T)$ defines a solution of the universal Whitham equations. This interesting point of view considers the Whitham hierarchy as a way to define a special system of coordinates on the moduli space of curves with jets of local coordinates at one puncture (or more). Next, from [56] we have the following statement. First define Π_s where $dp(\Pi_s) = 0$ and set $\pi_s = p(\Pi_s)$ (note dp must vanish at $2g$ points since $\deg(dp) = 2g - 2$ - cf. [72]). Thus p can be used as a coordinate except at the $2g$ points Π_s and the parameters π_s , $U_i^p = \oint_{B_i} dp$ then form a full system of local coordinates on $M^* = \{\Sigma_g, p, k^{-1}\}$. The zero curvature form (5.1) is then equivalent to the compatible system of evolution equations

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_A k(p, T) &= \{k(p, T), \Omega_A(p, T)\}; \quad \partial_A U_i^p = \partial_X U_i^A; \\ U_i^A &= \oint_{B_i} d\Omega_A; \quad \partial_A \pi_s = \partial_A p(\Pi_s) = \partial_X \Omega_A(\Pi_s) \end{aligned} \quad (5.28)$$

One can add here also holomorphic differentials $d\omega_i$ as Hamiltonians with corresponding times a_i (where $dQ \sim dp$ here).

If one works with the subspace N of M^* with fixed normalized meromorphic differential dE (E as in (5.20)) there are two systems of local coordinates. One is given by u_i ($i = 0, \dots, n-2$), π_s , and U_i^p (so $3g + n - 1$ parameters whereas one expects $3g - 3 + 1$ for Riemann surfaces with one puncture and $n + 1$ for a normalized n -jet, giving $3g + n - 1$ as desired). A second set of parameters is given by

$$U_i^E = \oint_{B_i} dE; \quad E_s = E(q_s) \quad (5.29)$$

where $dE(q_s) = 0$ ($s = 1, \dots, D - g$). Here $dE \sim d(k^n + O(k^{-1}))$ which indicates a pole of order $n + 1$ ($k^{n-1} dk \sim -z^{-n+1}(dz/z^2) = -dz/z^{n+1}$ for $z = 1/k$) so $\deg(dE) = 2g - 2 \Rightarrow$ the number of zeros is $2g - 2 + n + 1 = 2g + n - 1$. For $D = 3g + n - 1$ we get $D - g = 2g + n - 1$ so $1 \leq s \leq D - g$ as in [56]. Then the restriction of the Whitham hierarchy to N is given by the compatible equations (5.4).

Let now dH_i be a normalized differential defined on A_i such that $\oint_{A_i} dH_i = 0$. Then there exists a unique differential dS_H such that dS_H is holomorphic on Σ_g except for the A_i where it has jumps

$$dS_H^+(P) - dS_H^-(P) = dH_i(P) \quad (P \in A_i); \quad \oint_{A_i} dS_H = 0 \quad (5.30)$$

It is then stated in [56] that for any solution of the Whitham equations on N there exists constants T_A^0 and differentials dH_i independent of T , such that this solution is given implicitly via

$$\frac{d\mathcal{S}}{dp}(q_s, T) = 0; \quad d\mathcal{S}(p, T) = \sum_A (T_A - T_A^0) d\Omega_A(p, T) + dS_H \quad (5.31)$$

(we have added the d in front of $\mathcal{S}$ and Ω_A). This is not entirely clear. Then it is stated that these relations imply $d\mathcal{S} = QdE$ where $Q(p)$ is holomorphic on Σ_g away from the A_i and ∞ with jumps

$$Q^+(E) - Q^-(E) = \frac{dH_i(E)}{dE} \quad (E \in A_i) \quad (5.32)$$

on the A_i . This seems formally OK and, in a situation with constant jumps $dH_i(P) = T_{Q,i}dE(P)$, dQ is said to be single valued on Σ_g . This seems to say $Q^+(E) - Q^-(E) = T_{Q,i}$ which corresponds to $\oint_{B_i} dQ = -T_{Q,i}$ by (5.35) below (note one defines the $T_{Q,i}$ differently in the following and we refer to Remark 5.1 for some clarification).

Thus consider now $\tilde{N} = \{\Sigma_g, dQ, dE\}$ with dQ holomorphic away from $P_1 \sim \infty$. Take coordinates π_s, U_i^p, u_i , and the coefficients b_{1j} in $Q = \sum_1^\infty b_{1j}p^j + O(p^{-1})$ and use times $T_j, a_j, T_{Q,i} = -\oint_{B_i} dE$ and $T_{E,i} = \oint_{B_i} dQ$. The differentials $d\Omega_{E,i}$ and $d\Omega_{Q,i}$ coupled to $T_{E,i}$ and $T_{Q,i}$ are uniquely defined via analyticity plus jumps on A_i of the form

$$d\Omega_{E,i}^+ - d\Omega_{E,i}^- = \delta_{ij}dE; \quad d\Omega_{Q,i}^+ - d\Omega_{Q,i}^- = \delta_{ij}dQ; \quad (5.33)$$

$$\oint_{A_j} d\Omega_{E,i} = \oint_{A_j} d\Omega_{Q,i} = 0 \quad (j = 1, \dots, g)$$

As indicated earlier one can consider these times as coordinates on $\tilde{N}$ so that $\Sigma_g = \Sigma_g(T)$, $dQ = dQ(T)$, and $dE = dE(T)$. Then one asserts in [56] that for $(\clubsuit\bullet)$ $d\mathcal{S}(E, T) = Q(E, T)dE$ one has $\partial_A \mathcal{S} = \Omega_A$. In fact one writes

$$d\mathcal{S} = \sum_0^\infty T_i d\Omega_i + \sum_1^g (a_i d\omega_i + T_{E,j} d\Omega_{E,j} + T_{Q,j} d\Omega_{Q,j}) \quad (5.34)$$

(we have added some d 's and the $T_{Q,j}$ terms). The “proof” is marginal at best and looks at $\partial_{Q,j}$ only. Consider $\partial_{Q,j} d\mathcal{S}(E, T)$. From $(\clubsuit\bullet)$ it follows that $\partial_{Q,j} d\mathcal{S}$ is holomorphic except on A_j . On different sides of A_j the coordinates are E^- and $E^+ = E^- - T_{Q,j}$ so (for $E^- \in A_j$) take derivatives in $Q(E^- - T_{Q,j}) - Q(E^-) = T_{E,j}$ (cf. (5.35) applied to E and Q !) to obtain $\partial_{Q,j} Q^+ - \partial_{Q,j} Q^- = (dQ/dE)$ (i.e. $\partial T_{E,j}/\partial T_{Q,j} = 0 = \partial_{Q,j} Q^+ - \partial_{Q,j} Q^- - dQ/dE$) and this implies $\partial_{Q,j} d\mathcal{S}(E, T) = d\Omega_{Q,j}$. As a corollary one concludes that $E(p, T)$ and $Q(p, T)$ satisfy the Whitham equations $\partial_A E = \{E, \Omega_A\}$ and $\partial_A Q = \{Q, \Omega_A\}$ plus the classical string equation $\{Q, E\} = 1$.

REMARK 5.1. We make here a few remarks about differentials with a view toward clarifying some matters above. We recall first (following [5]) that an abelian differential is a meromorphic one form given locally via $\omega = f(z)dz$ where f is meromorphic in its domain. Evidently $d\omega = 0$ and one defines a primitive via $\Omega(P) = \int_{P_0}^P \omega$ on any simply connected domain. This is called an abelian integral and one must be careful in their definition over the whole surface. Thus let (A_j, B_j) be a canonical homology basis and define $\hat{A}_j = \int_{A_j} d\Omega$ with $\hat{B}_j = \int_{B_j} d\Omega$. Given a cycle $\gamma = \sum_i (m_i B_i + n_i A_i)$ one has $\int_\gamma d\Omega = \sum_i (m_i \hat{B}_i + n_i \hat{A}_i)$. Abelian integrals of the third kind have logarithmic singularities and it is necessary to supplement the above cyclic periods by additional polar periods in order to specify precisely the multivaluedness. Thus if $d\Omega$ has poles at points P_j one writes $c_j = \int_{\gamma_j} d\Omega$, $j = 1, \dots, n$, where γ_j is a cycle homologous to zero containing P_j . Evidently $c_j = 2\pi i \text{Res}(d\Omega, P_j)$ and necessarily $\sum_{sp} c_j = 0$ (where $sp \sim$ singular points). One writes Σ^0 for the surface obtained by removing all A and B cycles. Letting A_j^+, A_j^- and B_j^+, B_j^- be the left and right edges of the appropriate cuts, Σ^0 has boundary $\partial\Sigma^0 = \sum_1^g (A_j^+ + B_j^+ - A_j^- - B_j^-)$. Any abelian

integral $\Omega(P)$ of the first or second kind (i.e. holomorphic or meromorphic with residues equal to zero at all singular points) is single valued on Σ^0 . At the boundary it is required that

$$\Omega(P)|_{A_j^+} - \Omega(P)|_{A_j^-} = -\hat{B}_j; \quad \Omega(P)|_{B_j^+} - \Omega(P)|_{B_j^-} = \hat{A}_j \quad (5.35)$$

This allows continuation of Ω as a single valued function on the universal cover of Σ . To determine a single valued branch of a third kind abelian integral one must draw additional cuts Γ_j between P_0 and P_j , where P_j are the singular points. Then the polar period formulas are supplemented with

$$\Omega(P)|_{\Gamma_j^+} - \Omega(P)|_{\Gamma_j^-} = c_j \quad (5.36)$$

The Riemann bilinear relations yield

$$\begin{aligned} (i) \quad \sum_1^g (\hat{A}'_k \hat{B}_k - \hat{A}_k \hat{B}'_k) &= 0; \quad (ii) \quad \sum_1^g (\hat{A}'_k \hat{B}_k - \hat{A}_k \hat{B}'_k) = \frac{2\pi i}{(n-1)!} \frac{d^{n-1}}{dz^{n-1}} \Omega'(z)|_{z=z_0}; \\ (iii) \quad \sum_1^g (\hat{A}'_k \hat{B}_k - \hat{A}_k \hat{B}'_k) &= 2\pi i \sum_1^n c_j \Omega'(P_j) \equiv 2\pi i \sum_1^n c_j \int_{P_0}^{P_j} d\Omega' \end{aligned} \quad (5.37)$$

where in (i) Ω, Ω' are integrals of the first kind, in (ii) Ω' is of first kind and Ω is of the second kind with a single pole at P_0 with local parameter chosen so that $d\Omega = [(z - z_0)^{-n} + O(1)]dz$, $n > 1$, and in (iii) Ω' is of first kind and Ω is of third kind with no more than logarithmic singularities at P_j , $j = 1, \dots, n$ and $c_j = \text{Res}(d\Omega, P_j)$ (the integration contours in (iii) are chosen to be distinct from the basic A or B cycles). As a consequence one knows that any abelian differential of the second or third kind with zero a-periods (b-periods) or with all purely imaginary (purely real) cyclic periods is uniquely defined by its principal parts at the singular points. The basic holomorphic differentials $d\omega_j$ are normalized by the condition $\int_{A_j} d\omega_k = \delta_{jk}$ and for hyperelliptic situations one can write

$$d\omega_j = \sum_1^g c_{jk} \frac{\lambda^{g-k} d\lambda}{\mu} \quad (1 \leq j \leq g); \quad c_{jk} = 2\pi i (A^{-1})_{jk}; \quad A_{jk} = \int_{A_k} \frac{\lambda^{g-j} d\lambda}{\mu} \quad (5.38)$$

Here the matrix $B_{jk} = \int_{B_j} d\omega_k$ is the period matrix and due to the placements of $2\pi i$ in the normalization one has $\Re B < 0$.

REMARK 5.2. In summary, for dKP, $\mathcal{S} = \sum_1^\infty \mathcal{B}_n T_n$ is consistent with $\partial_n \mathcal{S} = \mathcal{B}_n$ and $\partial_\lambda \mathcal{S} = \mathcal{M}$. Evidently $\partial_n \mathcal{S} = \mathcal{B}_n$ and for completeness we show that $\partial_\lambda \mathcal{S} = \mathcal{M}$ (cf. [19]). Thus from the equations before (4.5)

$$\mathcal{S} = \sum_1^\infty T_n \lambda^n + \sum_1^\infty T_n \sum_1^\infty \partial_n S_{j+1} \lambda^{-j} \quad (5.39)$$

and one recalls that $2T = \sum_1^\infty T_n \partial_n F$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_\lambda \mathcal{S} &= \sum_1^\infty n T_n \lambda^{n-1} - \sum_1^\infty T_n \sum_1^\infty j \partial_n S_{j+1} \lambda^{-j-1} = \\ &= \sum_1^\infty n T_n \lambda^{n-1} + \sum_1^\infty \sum_1^\infty T_n F_{jn} \lambda^{-j-1} \end{aligned} \quad (5.40)$$

But the last series is $\sum_1^\infty \lambda^{-j-1} [\partial_j \sum_{n=1}^\infty T_n F_n - F_j] = \sum_1^\infty F_j \lambda^{-j-1}$ which implies that $\partial_\lambda \mathcal{S} = \mathcal{M}$. For Riemann surfaces with $d\mathcal{S}$ as in (5.34) we can write $\partial_A d\mathcal{S} = d\Omega_A$ with $\oint_{A_i} d\mathcal{S} = a_i$ so that this is commensurate with (5.25) for example where $T_{E,i} = T_{Q,i} = 0$. Note here $\tau_{B_i,E} = \oint_{B_i} dE \sim -T_{Q,i}$ and $\tau_{B_i,Q} = \oint_{B_i} dQ \sim T_{E,i}$ and since these τ 's are not used much in [58] they should probably be renamed to correspond to their natural function here (i.e. interchange the subscripts E and Q). In any event it appears that dual variables a_i^D to the action like “times” a_i could be defined in Whitham theory via

$$a_j^D = \sum_1^\infty T_n \oint_{B_j} d\Omega_n + \sum_1^g a_i B_{ij} + \sum_1^g T_A \oint_{B_j} d\Omega_A \quad (5.41)$$

5.3 Symplectic geometry

We sketch here the construction of [58] for the symplectic form $\omega_{\mathcal{M}}$ following [16]. Thus go back to $\mathcal{M}_g(n, m) = \{\Sigma_g, P_1 \sim \infty, [k]_n, [k]_m, E, Q\}$ defined at the beginning of Section 5.2, with times defined via (5.22). Define $\mathcal{D}$, $\mathcal{N}$, $\mathcal{M}$, and $\mathcal{N}^g$ as before and work on $\mathcal{N}$. We recall that although E and Q are multivalued on the universal fibration their differentials are well defined on $\mathcal{N}$. E and Q are well defined near P_1 and their analytic continuations by different paths can only change by multiples of their residues or periods along closed cycles. On a leaf of the foliation the ambiguities remain constant and disappear upon differentiation. Hence one has differentials δE and δQ on the fibrations which reduce to dE and dQ acting on vectors tangent to the fiber. One can trivialize the fibration $\mathcal{N}$ with the variables $a_1, \dots, a_g$ along the leaf $\mathcal{M}$ and e.g. E along the fiber. Then dQ coincides with $(dQ/dE)dE$ where $dE \sim \delta E$ is viewed as one of the elements of the basis of one forms for $\mathcal{N}$ and the full differential for Q is $\delta Q = dQ + \sum_1^g (\partial Q / \partial a_i) da_i \equiv dQ + \delta^E Q$.

Now if one considers the full differential $\delta(QdE)$ on $\mathcal{N}$ it is readily seen that it is well defined despite the multivaluedness of Q . In fact the partial derivatives $\partial_{a_i}(QdE)$ along the base $\mathcal{M}$ are holomorphic since the singular parts of the differentials as well as the ambiguities are all fixed. In particular $(\partial / \partial a_i)(QdE) = d\omega_i$ where $d\omega_i$ is a basis of normalized holomorphic differentials $\oint_{A_i} d\omega_j = \delta_{ij}$ with $\oint_{B_i} d\omega_j = b_{ij}$. To see this note that it is implicit in (5.22) since by definition of the a_i , $(\partial a_i / \partial a_j) = \delta_{ij} = \oint_{A_i} (\partial(QdE) / \partial a_j)$ which implies $(\partial(QdE) / \partial a_j) = d\omega_j$. Formally then one defines $\omega_{\mathcal{M}}$ on $\mathcal{N}^g$ via

$$\omega_{\mathcal{M}} = \delta \left(\sum_1^g Q(\gamma_i) dE(\gamma_i) \right) = \sum_1^g \delta Q(\gamma_i) \wedge dE(\gamma_i) = \sum_1^g da_i \wedge d\omega_i \quad (5.42)$$

The first expression seems formally reasonable on $\mathcal{N}^g$ and the last appears to be a calculation of the form $\omega_{\mathcal{M}} = \delta(QdE) = \sum_1^g da_i \wedge [\partial(QdE) / \partial a_i] = \sum_1^g da_i \wedge d\omega_i$. Now go to KP for illustration and background. One can work with a (nonspecial) divisor $(\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_g)$ giving rise to quasiperiodic functions of $t = (t_n)$ $1 \leq n < \infty$, of the form $u_{i,n}$ $1 \leq i \leq n-2$, $2 \leq n < \infty$, which arise as solutions of an integrable hierarchy. The BA function is defined as a meromorphic function away from P with simple poles at the γ_i ($1 \leq i \leq g$) and an essential singularity at P of the form $\psi(t, z) = \exp(\sum_1^\infty t_n z^{-n}) (1 + \sum_1^\infty \xi_i(t) z^i)$. There is a Lax operator (in general one for each puncture) $L_n = \partial^n + \sum_0^{n-2} u_{i,n} \partial^i$ with $(\partial / \partial t_n - L_n) \psi(t, z) = 0$ ($\partial = \partial_x$, $x = t_1$). Thus there is a map $\{\Sigma, P, z, \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_g\} \rightarrow \{u_{i,n}(t)\}$. An explicit form for the BA function for KP is given in [58] (recall $\Re \oint_C d\Omega_n = 0$ for any cycle C here and cf. [5] for various forms of BA functions - thus the form of ψ in [58] appears different from (2.1) but it must be equivalent). Similarly the dual BA function ψ^* is defined as before (and denoted by $\psi^\dagger$ in [58]). We note that for the Toda lattice one

takes $N = 2$ punctures and a common theme here to some other work is $d(\lambda_{SW}) \sim \omega_{\mathcal{M}}$ in a suitable sense (cf. Section 5.2).

An element in $\mathcal{N}^g(n, 1)$ gives rise to a datum in a space $\hat{\mathcal{N}}^g = \{u_{in}(t)|_0^{n-2}\}$ via a mapping $\Xi : (\Sigma, P, [z]_n, E, Q, \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_g) \rightarrow (\Sigma, P, z, \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_g) \rightarrow \{u_{i,n}(t)|_{i=0}^{n-2}\}$. Take a real leaf $\mathcal{M}$ (i.e. $\Re \oint_C dE = \Re \oint_C dQ = 0$ for all cycles C on Γ and note this is automatic for $dQ \sim dp \sim d\Omega_1$ and $dE \sim d\Omega_n$ with real normalization). We also take $t_1 \sim x$. One wants now to express $\omega_{\mathcal{M}}$ in terms of forms on the space of functions $\{u_{i,n}(t)\}$. First the $u_{i,n}(t)$ can be written in terms of the asymptotic BA coefficients ξ_i and one knows that $(\partial_x \psi / \psi) = z^{-1} + \sum_1^\infty h_s z^s$ and $(\partial_x \psi^* / \psi^*) = -z^{-1} + \sum_1^\infty h_s^* z^s$ (cf. [10] and Lemma 3.1, where e.g. $\partial = L + \sum_1^\infty \sigma_j^1 L^{-j}$ which implies e.g. $(\partial \psi / \psi) = \lambda + \sum_1^\infty \sigma_j^1 \lambda^{-j}$ for $\lambda \sim z^{-1}$). In any event the first $n-1$ coefficients $h_s = \sigma_s^1$ or h_s^* are differential polynomials in the $u_{i,n}$ (initial data $\xi_s(t)|_{x=0} = \phi_s(t_2, \dots)$ determine ξ_s for $s \leq n-1$). Writing $H_s = \langle h_s \rangle$ one gets now $p = z^{-1} + \sum_1^\infty H_s z^s$ (recall also from Lemma 3.1 that $\langle s_{n+1} \rangle = -n < \sigma_n^1 \rangle = -n H_n$). We note that one uses $\langle \rangle_x$ and $\langle \rangle_{xy}$ averaging at various places in [58] but generically this should correspond to ergodic averaging.

A result in [58] now asserts that for $\mathcal{N}^g$ the Jacobian bundle over a real leaf $\mathcal{M}$ of the moduli space $\mathcal{M}_g(n, 1)$ the symplectic form $\omega_{\mathcal{M}}$ can be written as

$$\omega_{\mathcal{M}} = \text{Res}_P \frac{\langle \delta \psi^* \wedge \delta L_n \psi \rangle}{\langle \psi^* \psi \rangle} dp = \sum_1^{n-1} \langle \delta J_s \wedge \int^x \delta^* h_{n-s}^* \rangle \quad (5.43)$$

Here h_s, h_s^* are differential polynomials as above, the differential forms δh_s and $\delta^* h_s^*$ are defined via $\delta h_s = \sum_{i=0}^{n-2} \delta u_{i,n} \sum_\ell (-\partial)^\ell (\partial h_s / \partial u_{i,n}^{(\ell)})$ and, in a standard manner, $\delta^* h_s^* = \sum_{i=0}^{n-2} \delta u_{i,n}^{(\ell)} \sum (\partial h_s^* / \partial u_{i,n}^{(\ell)})$, while δJ_s is a linear combination of the δu_{in} , ($0 \leq i \leq n-2$). Another (essentially more complicated) form is also given in [58] for the last term in (5.43) and we will give some evidence for its validity without actually proving it (see below). In any event this is a fascinating result but the proof in [58] requires some embellishment which we extract here from [16] with some sign changes. First one must come to terms with an expression

$$\begin{aligned} \delta E &= \delta p \left(\frac{dE}{dp} \right) - \left(\frac{\langle \psi^* \delta L_n \psi \rangle}{\langle \psi^* \psi \rangle} \right) \equiv \\ &\equiv \delta p = \left(\frac{dp}{dE} \right) \delta E + \left(\frac{\langle \psi^* \delta L_n \psi \rangle}{\psi^* \psi} \right) \left(\frac{dp}{dE} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (5.44)$$

where $\delta L_n = \sum_0^{n-2} \delta u_{i,n} \partial^i$ (see below) and then it will follow from (5.42) (with $\delta p \sim \delta Q$ and $\delta E \sim dE$) that

$$\omega_{\mathcal{M}} = \sum_1^g \left(\frac{\langle \psi^* \delta L_n \psi \rangle}{\langle \psi^* \psi \rangle} \right) (\gamma_s) \wedge dp(\gamma_s) \quad (5.45)$$

The formula (5.44) is asserted to come from [53] but to see this one has to interpret $\delta u_{i,n}$ as arising from $\epsilon \partial_X U_{i,n}(X, T)$ in the first order term. Indeed we can look at (3.22) with the last two terms absent on the leaves of our foliation and written generically for $L_n \sim \Omega_n$ as $(\spadesuit) \langle \psi^* (L_n^1 \partial_X L_k - L_k^1 \partial_X L_n) \psi \rangle = \partial_X \Omega_k \langle \psi^* L_n^1 \psi \rangle - \partial_X \Omega_n \langle \psi^* L_k^1 \psi \rangle$. Then for $L_n = L_3 \sim \Omega_3$ and $L_k = L_1 \sim p$ one has $L_1 = \partial$, $\delta L_1 \sim \partial_X L_1 = 0$, $L_1^1 = -1$ and $-\langle \psi^* \partial_X L_3 \psi \rangle = \partial_X p \langle \psi^* L_3^1 \psi \rangle + \partial_X \Omega_3 \langle \psi^* \psi \rangle$. Written in terms of $\delta p \sim \epsilon \partial_X p$, $\delta L_3 \sim \epsilon \partial_X L_3$, etc. one obtains $\delta \Omega_3 = -\delta p (\langle \psi^* L_3^1 \psi \rangle / \langle \psi^* \psi \rangle) - (\langle \psi^* \delta L_3 \psi \rangle / \langle \psi^* \psi \rangle)$ while from Theorem 3.2 (with $L_3^1 \sim A^1$) we have $(\langle \psi^* L_3^1 \psi \rangle / \langle \psi^* \psi \rangle) = -(d\Omega_3 / dp)$, or generically $(d\Omega_n / dp) = -(\langle \psi^* L_n^1 \psi \rangle$

$/ < \psi^* \psi >$), and (5.44) follows. The formula ($\bullet\spadesuit$) can also be used for a more general theorem in [58]. Thus (5.45) holds and writing $\gamma_s(t)$ for the zeros of ψ away from P (corresponding by Riemann-Roch to the fixed poles γ_s for $t=0$) one can pick $t_1, \dots, t_g$ (generically) as times for which the flows $\gamma_s(t)$ are independent and use them as coordinates on $S^g(\Sigma)$. These can be transferred to the system of coordinates $f(\gamma_1), \dots, f(\gamma_g)$ for f an Abelian integral on Σ via $(\partial/\partial t_i)f(\gamma(t)) = \text{Res}_{\gamma(t)}[(\partial/\partial t_i)\psi(t, z)/\psi(t, z)]df$. In the present case, writing $(\delta_t \psi/\psi) = \sum_1^g (\partial_j \psi/\psi) dt_j$ and using $\sum \text{Res}_{\gamma_s} = -\text{Res}_P$ one obtains $\omega_{\mathcal{M}} = \text{Res}_P [(< \psi^* \delta L_n \psi > / < \psi^* \psi >) \wedge (\delta_t \psi/\psi)|_{t=0}] dp$. It is not unnatural to see here an apparent change in the number of parameters.

Now note that $\psi^* \delta L_n \psi = \psi^* \sum_0^{n-2} \delta u_{i,n} \partial^i \psi = \sum_0^{n-2} \delta u_{i,n} \psi^* \partial^i \psi$ and we recall $\partial \psi/\psi = z^{-1} + \sum_1^\infty h_s z^s$ from which $(\partial^j \psi/\psi) = z^{-j} [1 + \sum_1^\infty c_{jp} z^{p+1}]$ ($c_{jp} = c_{jp}(h_s, \partial^i h_s)$). Then since $dp / < \psi^* \psi > = [-z^{-2} + O(1)] dz$ and $\psi^* \psi = 1 + \sum_1^\infty s_n z^n$ for small z , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{\psi^* \delta L_n \psi}{< \psi^* \psi >} \right) dp &\sim \frac{\sum_0^{n-2} \delta u_{i,n} \psi^* \partial^i \psi dp}{< \psi^* \psi >} \sim \\ &\sim - \sum_1^{n-2} \delta u_{i,n} z^{-i} \left(1 + \sum_1^\infty c_{ip} z^{p+1} \right) (z^{-2} + o(1)) (1 + \sum_1^\infty s_n z^n) dz \sim \sum_1^\infty \delta J_s z^{-n-1+s} dz \end{aligned} \quad (5.46)$$

where δJ_s is by construction a linear combination of the $\delta u_{i,n}$, ($0 \leq i \leq n-2$). Averaging now in (5.46) and using (5.44) one obtains $< \delta J_s > = 0$ for $s = 1, \dots, n-1$. In addition it is claimed in [58] that $\delta H_s = 0$ for $s = 1, \dots, n-1$, since the mean values $H_s = < h_s >$ are fixed along $\mathcal{M}$ (this is not entirely clear). Hence $\omega_{\mathcal{M}} = \sum_1^g < \delta J_{j+n} > \wedge dt_j$. Further from [10, 13] one has $(\partial_j \psi^* / \psi^*) = -\lambda^j - \sum_1^\infty \sigma_s^j \lambda^{-s} = -z^{-j} + \sum_1^\infty h_{s,j}^* z^s$. This leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial_j \psi^* (\delta L_n \psi)}{< \psi^* \psi >} dp &= \frac{\partial_j \psi^*}{\psi^*} \times \frac{\psi^* (\delta L_n \psi)}{< \psi^* \psi >} dp = \\ &= \left(-z^{-j} + \sum_1^\infty h_{p,j}^* z^p \right) \times \left(- \sum_1^\infty \delta J_s(t) z^{-n-1+s} \right) dz \end{aligned} \quad (5.47)$$

which implies

$$\delta J_{j+n}(t) = \sum_1^{n-1} \delta J_s h_{n-s,j}^* \quad (5.48)$$

Hence $\omega_{\mathcal{M}} = \text{Res}_P (< \delta_t \psi^* \wedge \delta L_n \psi > / < \psi^* \psi >) dp$ holds and an argument is suggested in [58] to extend δ_t to a full δ so that the first formula in (5.43) is proved (we have made some adjustments in minus signs from [16, 58]). For the second formula in (5.43) one looks at the relation $\delta \log \psi^* = \delta \left(c(t_i, i \geq 2) + \int_{x_0}^x \partial_x \log \psi^* \right) = \delta \sum_1^\infty \left(c_s(t_i, i \geq 2) + \int_{x_0}^x h_s^* z^s dx \right)$. This implies

$$\text{Res}_P \left(\frac{(< \delta \log \psi^* > \wedge (\psi^* \delta L_n \psi >))}{< \psi^* \psi >} \right) dp = \omega_{\mathcal{M}} = \sum_1^{n-1} < \delta J_s \wedge \int^x \delta^* h_{n-s}^* dx > \quad (5.49)$$

which is the second identity in (5.43). In [58] one observes that by definitions δJ_s does not contain variations of derivatives of u_i and then claims that $\delta J_s = -n(\partial h_s / \partial u) \delta u \sim -n \delta h_s$. This seems unclear but we will write out some relevant formulas below. Finally we note that there is a little interplay between $\delta \sim \epsilon \partial_X$ and $X = \epsilon x$ in the last two lines which we do not elaborate upon here (cf. [19] for further details of calculations, etc.). The examples in [58] have some curious features but

in any event one should keep in mind the conditions $\delta H_s = 0$ when selecting functions. One notes that of course the symplectic structure involving δJ_s , $\delta^* h_s^*$, etc. (i.e. the δu_{in}) does not include the time dynamics so KdV $\sim L_2 = \partial^2 + u$ for example and Bousinesq $\sim L_3 = \partial^3 + u\partial + v$. Adaptions and applications of the above fibration framework to $SU(n)$, $N = 2$ susy YM theory are also given in [58].

In order to compare the δJ_s and δh_s we make a few calculations here. Thus δJ_s is given via (5.46) as a linear combination of the δu_{in} with complicated coefficients depending on h_s , $\partial^i h_s$ and the coefficients s_n in $\psi^* \psi$ (note the s_n can be expressed via ξ_i and ξ_i^* while the term $dp / < \psi^* \psi >$ can be written $(z^{-2} + \sum_0^\infty p_m z^m) dz$ where the p_m are independent of the u_{in}). We recall here (cf. [9, 10, 65]) for $\psi = \exp(\xi)[1 + \sum_1^\infty \xi_j z^j]$ and $\psi^* = \exp(-\xi)[1 + \sum_1^\infty \xi_i^* z^i]$, with $L = \partial + \sum_1^\infty u_{i+1} \partial^{-i}$ ($u_2 \sim u$) one has $u_2 = -\xi_1'$, $u_3 = -\xi_2' + \xi_1 \xi_1'$, etc. Further from $\partial \psi = z^{-1} \psi + \exp(\xi) \sum \xi_i' z^i$ and $(\partial \psi / \psi) = z^{-1} + \sum h_s z^s$ we get

$$(1 + \sum_1^\infty \xi_j z^j) (\sum_1^\infty h_s z^s) = \sum_1^\infty \xi_k' z^k \Rightarrow \xi_m' = h_m + \sum_1^{m-1} \xi_j h_{m-j} \quad (5.50)$$

so e.g. $h_1 = \xi_1'$, $\xi_2' = \xi_1 h_1 + h_2$, $\xi_3' = h_3 + h_2 \xi_1 + \xi_2 h_1$, etc. Hence $h_1 = -u_2$, $h_2 = \xi_2' - \xi_1 h_1 = \xi_1 \xi_1' - u_3 + \xi_1 u_2 = -u_3$, etc. In the present situation one is interested in $L_+^n \sim L_n$ so we note that $L_+^2 = \partial^2 + 2u_2$, $L_+^3 = \partial^3 + 3u_2 \partial + (6u_2' + 3u_3)$, etc. (we recall also $L_n = \partial^n + \sum_0^{n-2} u_{in} \partial^i$). Thus for $n = 3$ we have $u_{03} = 3u_3 + 6u_2'$, $u_{13} = 3u_2$, etc. Calculations based on this seem to agree with the formulas in [58], namely, for fixed n

$$h_1 = -\frac{u_{n-2,n}}{n}; \quad h_2 = \frac{n-1}{n} u_{n-2,n}' - \frac{u_{n-3,n}}{n}; \quad \dots \quad (5.51)$$

(formulas for h_i^* are also given in [58]). Thus for $n = 3$ one has $h_1 = -(1/3)u_{13} = -u_2$ and $h_2 = (2/3)u_{13}' - (1/3)u_{03} = -u_3 + 2u_2' - u_2' = -u_3$, etc. As for the Q_s we write e.g.

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial^2 \psi}{\psi} &= [z^{-1} + \sum_1^\infty h_s z^s]^2 + \sum_1^\infty h_s' z^s = \\ &= z^{-2} [1 + 2 \sum h_s z^{s+1} + 2 \sum_{s \neq k} h_s h_k z^{s+k+2} + \sum h_s^2 z^{2s+2} + \sum h_s' z^{s+2}] \end{aligned} \quad (5.52)$$

Then writing this as $z^{-2} [1 + \sum_1^\infty c_{2p} z^{p+1}]$ one has ($\clubsuit$) $c_{21} = 2h_1$, $c_{22} = 2h_2 + h_1'$, $c_{23} = 2h_3 + h_1^2 + h_2'$, $\dots$. Now look at (5.46) for $n = 3$ so we have to consider $\delta u_{03} \psi$ and $\delta u_{13} \partial \psi$, yielding for $\Xi = \psi^* \delta L_3 \psi$ the formula

$$\Xi = [\delta u_{03} + \delta u_{13} (z^{-1} + \sum h_s z^s)] (1 + \sum s_m z^m) \quad (5.53)$$

Putting in the $(dp / < \psi^* \psi >)$ term we obtain for $n = 3$

$$\begin{aligned} (5.46) &= \sum_1^\infty \delta J_s z^{s-4} dz = [\delta u_{13} z^{-3} + \delta u_{03} z^{-2}] \times \\ &\times [1 + \sum_1^\infty s_m z^m] [1 + \sum_1^\infty h_s z^{s+1}] [1 + \sum_0^\infty p_k z^{k+2}] dz = \\ &= [\delta u_{13} z^{-3} + \delta u_{03} z^{-2}] [1 + s_1 z + (s_2 + h_1 + p_0) z^2 + \dots] dz \end{aligned} \quad (5.54)$$

Consequently $\delta J_1 = \delta u_{13} = 3\delta u_2 = -3\delta h_1$, $\delta J_2 = s_1\delta u_{13} + \delta u_{03}$, etc. Note $s_1 = \xi_1 + \xi_1^* = 0$ so $\delta J_2 = \delta u_{03} = \delta(3u_3 + 6u_2') = -3\delta h_2 + 6\delta u_2'$ (note also $h_2 \sim -3u_{03} \bmod u_2'$). We see that in some “generic” manner the relation $\delta J_n \sim -n\delta h_n$ seems to be holding (modulo terms involving derivatives of the u_{in}). Hence provisionally one could say that there is some evidence for a formula of the form

$$\omega_{\mathcal{M}} \sim -n \sum_1^{n-1} \langle \delta h_s \wedge \int^x \delta^* h_{n-s}^* \rangle \quad (5.55)$$

as in [58], where δh_s only deals with the appropriate potentials and not their derivatives. However the expression (5.43) in terms of δJ_s is simpler and more direct so we treat this as the basic such formula.

6 REMARKS ON BA FUNCTIONS

We go here to [68] for a construction of BA functions with certain α_i variables inserted explicitly which connect to the a_i “times” of SW theory via $i\epsilon\alpha_j = a_j$. This leads to expressions for $\mathcal{S}$ and F (action and prepotential) in two different forms from which some comparisons can be made, of use in various directions (cf. [17, 44, 68]). The construction in [68] is for the Toda theory (with two punctures on the Riemann surface) but, in keeping with the spirit of this paper, we will display matters for the KP situation only. The idea is to insert new times α_i in the BA function (2.1) (recall $B_{ij} = \oint_{B_j} d\omega_i$, $U = (U_j) = (1/2\pi i) \oint_{B_j} d\Omega^1$, etc.) via for example

$$\begin{aligned} \psi = \exp \left[\int_{P_0}^P x d\Omega^1 + y d\Omega^2 + t d\Omega^3 + i \sum_1^g \alpha_i d\omega_i \right] \times \\ \times \frac{\Theta(\mathcal{A}(P) + xU + yV + tW + i \sum_1^g \alpha_i (B_{ij}) + z_0)}{\Theta(\mathcal{A}(P) + z_0)} \end{aligned} \quad (6.1)$$

This is an alternate version of the BA function in [68], modulo $\bar{t}_n = 0$ (cf. [5]) for relations) or one can adapt the formulas of [68] to write (recall $\mathcal{A}(P) = (\int_{P_0}^P d\omega_j)$ and we set for convenience $\Omega_{jk} = \int_{B_k} d\Omega_j$ where $d\Omega_j \sim d\Omega^j$)

$$\begin{aligned} \psi = \exp \left[\sum_1^\infty t_j \left(\int_{P_0}^P d\Omega^j + \Omega^j(P_0) \right) + i \sum_1^g \alpha_j \left(\int_{P_0}^P d\omega_j + \omega_j(P_0) \right) \right] \times \\ \times \frac{\Theta(\mathcal{A}(P) + \sum_1^\infty (t_j/2\pi i)(\Omega_{jk}) + i \sum_1^g \alpha_j (B_{jk}) + z_0) \Theta(\mathcal{A}(P_\infty) + z_0)}{\Theta(\mathcal{A}(P_\infty) + \sum_1^\infty (t_j/2\pi i)(\Omega_{jk}) + i \sum_1^g \alpha_j (B_{jk}) + z_0) \Theta(\mathcal{A}(P) + z_0)} \end{aligned} \quad (6.2)$$

(note one can write here also $\int_{P_0}^P d\Omega_j \sim \int_{P_0}^P d\Omega_j + \Omega_j(P_0)$) and $\mathcal{A}(P) = (\int_{P_\infty}^P d\omega_j) + \mathcal{A}(P_\infty)$, where $\Omega_j \sim \lambda^j - \sum_1^\infty (q_{mj}/m) z^{m-1}$). We have attached a factor of $(1/2\pi i)$ to the (Ω_{jk}) in order to utilize (6.18) below. This kind of formula (6.2) provides a normalization as $z \rightarrow 0$ ($\lambda \rightarrow \infty$) since, for any P_0 , the theta function quotient tends to one. Next one constructs in an ad hoc manner the algebraic form of ψ near ∞ via vertex operators as ($\lambda \sim z^{-1}$)

$$\psi = \exp \left(\sum_1^\infty t_i \lambda^i \right) \times \frac{\tau(t - [\lambda^{-1}], \alpha)}{\tau(t, \alpha)} \quad (6.3)$$

(here $[\lambda^{-1}] \sim (1/n\lambda^n)$). Note that the $\alpha_i \int^P d\omega_i$ terms do not contribute to the essential singularity at ∞ .

Now the general action and prepotential theory associated with (6.1) (cf. [6, 16, 19, 44, 46, 68]) leads to

$$d\mathcal{S} = \sum_1^g a_j d\omega_j + \sum_1^\infty T_n d\Omega_n; \quad \frac{\partial d\mathcal{S}}{\partial a_j} = d\omega_j; \quad \frac{\partial d\mathcal{S}}{\partial T_n} = d\Omega_n \quad (6.4)$$

If we consider functions $F(a, T)$ related to $d\mathcal{S}$ via

$$\frac{\partial F}{\partial a_j} = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{B_j} d\mathcal{S}; \quad \partial_n F = -Res_\infty z^{-n} d\mathcal{S} \quad (6.5)$$

then, given the standard class of solutions of the Whitham hierarchy satisfying

$$2F = \sum_1^g a_j \frac{\partial F}{\partial a_j} + \sum_1^\infty T_n \frac{\partial F}{\partial T_n} \quad (6.6)$$

there results

$$2F = \sum_1^g \frac{a_j}{2\pi i} \oint_{B_j} d\mathcal{S} - \sum_1^\infty T_n Res_\infty z^{-n} d\mathcal{S} \quad (6.7)$$

(connections to [56] for example will be spelled out below). Writing now, in the notation of [68], $d\omega_j = -\sum_1^\infty \sigma_{jm} z^{m-1} dz$ with $d\Omega_n = [-nz^{-n-1} - \sum_1^\infty q_{mn} z^{m-1}] dz$, and using (6.4), (2.8) can be expanded to give

$$2F = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \sum_{j,k=1}^g B_{jk} a_j a_k + 2 \sum_1^g a_j \sum_1^\infty \sigma_{jk} T_k + \sum_{k,l=1}^\infty q_{kl} T_k T_l \quad (6.8)$$

Thus the expression (6.8) comes from the Riemann surface theory, without explicit reference to the BA function, and we consider now (6.2) and (6.3) to which ideas of dKP can be applied to introduce the slow variables T_k . This means that we will be able to introduce slow variables in two different ways and the resulting comparisons will show an equivalence of procedures. In practice this will enable one to treat ϵ on the same footing in the Whitham theory and in the dispersionless theory, and subsequent analysis will verify a construction in [17]. Thus from (6.2) and (6.3) one obtains an expression for τ of the form ($t_1 = x$, $t_2 = y$, $t_3 = t$, $\dots$)

$$\tau(t, \alpha) = \exp[\hat{F}(\alpha, t)] \Theta \left(\mathcal{A}(P_\infty) + \sum_1^\infty (t_j/2\pi i)(\Omega_{jk}) + i \sum_1^g \alpha_j (B_{jk}) + z_0 \right) \quad (6.9)$$

where $k = 1, \dots, g$ and

$$\hat{F}(\alpha, t) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k,l=1}^\infty q_{kl} t_k t_l - \frac{1}{4\pi i} \sum_{j,k=1}^\infty B_{jk} \alpha_j \alpha_k + i \sum_1^g \alpha_j \sum_1^\infty \sigma_{jk} t_k + \sum_1^\infty d_k t_k \quad (6.10)$$

(see also [45] for a similar form - recall here $\mathcal{A}(P) = (\int_{P_0}^P d\omega_j)$ and $P_0 \neq P_\infty$ is required - note that we have inserted a factor of $1/2\pi i$ with the (Ω_{jk})). Putting in the slow variables $T_k = \epsilon t_k$ and $a_k = i\epsilon \alpha_k$ one will find that the quadratic part of $\hat{F}$ in T is exactly $F(a, T)/\epsilon^2$. One recalls here that τ will have the form (4.2) so that $(F(a, T)/\epsilon^2) + (\sum d_k T_k/\epsilon)$ is a natural object (modulo a

multiplicative factor of lower order arising from the theta function in (6.9), which could be absorbed in an $\exp(A/\epsilon)$ term). To say this another way, (4.2) is the natural form of τ based on (6.3) and it is associated with $\psi \sim \exp[(1/\epsilon)S + O(1)]$ as in (4.2). Given the Riemann surface background based on (6.2), one is expressing the $O(1/\epsilon)$ term in $\tau = \exp[(1/\epsilon^2)F + O(1/\epsilon)]$ as $\exp[(1/\epsilon) \sum d_k T_k]$ times a suitable asymptotic expansion of theta functions (for such expansions see [27], pp. 40-49). In [68] one writes then from (6.9) and (6.1) respectively

$$\log \tau \left(\frac{T}{\epsilon}, \frac{a}{i\epsilon} \right) = \epsilon^{-2} \sum_0^\infty \epsilon^n F^{(n)}(T, a); \quad (6.11)$$

$$d \log \psi \left(p, \frac{T}{\epsilon}, \frac{a}{i\epsilon} \right) = \epsilon^{-1} \sum_0^\infty \epsilon^n d\mathcal{S}^{(n)}(p, T, a)$$

where $d\mathcal{S}^{(0)} \sim d\mathcal{S}$ in (6.4) and $F^{(0)} \sim F$ in (6.8).

Let us spell out some of the details now. Thus one notes in (6.2) that as $P \rightarrow P_\infty$ the theta function terms go to one and the asymptotic behavior is mainly determined by the exponent. Now consider identifying (6.2) and (6.3) as $P \rightarrow P_\infty$ ($P \rightarrow P_\infty \sim z \rightarrow 0 \sim \lambda \rightarrow \infty$) via $(\Theta_{asy} \sim \text{theta quotient in (6.2)})$

$$\frac{\tau_-}{\tau} e^{\sum_1^\infty t_j \lambda^j} \sim \exp \left[\sum_1^\infty t_j \left(\lambda^j - \sum_1^\infty q_{mj} \frac{z^m}{m} \right) - i \sum_1^g \alpha_j \sum_1^\infty \sigma_{jm} \frac{z^m}{m} \right] \Theta_{asy} \quad (6.12)$$

(write $\omega_j(P_0) = \int_{P_\infty}^{P_0} d\omega_j$ and note that $d(z^m) = m z^{m-1} dz = -m \lambda^{-m-1} d\lambda$). If we accept an ansatz (6.9) - (6.10), then e.g. (6.12) can be written out as indicated below. We write $i \sum_1^g \alpha_j (B_{jk}) + z_0 = \hat{z}(\alpha)$ with $\hat{z}(\alpha) + \sum_1^\infty (t_j/2\pi i)(\Omega_{jk}) = \tilde{z}(\alpha, t)$ and $\Delta \hat{F} = \hat{F}(\alpha, t - [z]) - \hat{F}(\alpha, t)$. Now look at $\Delta \hat{F}$ from (6.10) as

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta \hat{F} &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k,l=1}^\infty q_{kl} \left[\left(t_k - \frac{z^k}{k} \right) \left(t_l - \frac{z^l}{l} \right) - t_k t_l \right] - i \sum_{j=1}^g \sum_{k=1}^\infty \alpha_j \sigma_{jk} \frac{z^k}{k} - \sum_1^\infty d_k \frac{z^k}{k} = \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{k,l=1}^\infty q_{kl} \left[\left(t_k \frac{z^l}{l} + t_l \frac{z^k}{k} \right) - \frac{z^{k+l}}{kl} \right] - i \sum_{j=1}^g \sum_{k=1}^\infty \alpha_j \sigma_{jk} \frac{z^k}{k} - \sum_1^\infty d_k \frac{z^k}{k} \end{aligned} \quad (6.13)$$

From (6.12) we want then to balance

$$\begin{aligned} \log \Theta_{asy} &\sim \Delta \hat{F} + \sum_1^\infty t_j \sum_1^\infty q_{mj} \frac{z^m}{m} + i \sum_1^g \alpha_j \sum_1^\infty \sigma_{jm} \frac{z^m}{m} + \\ &+ \log \Theta \left(\mathcal{A}(P_\infty) - \sum_1^\infty \frac{z^j}{j} \frac{(\Omega_{jk})}{2\pi i} + \tilde{z} \right) - \log \Theta(\mathcal{A}(P_\infty) + \tilde{z}) \end{aligned} \quad (6.14)$$

Note also that $\mathcal{A}(P) - \mathcal{A}(P_\infty) \sim (\int_{P_\infty}^P d\omega_k) \sim -\sum_1^\infty \sigma_{km} (z^m/m)$. The balance demanded then involves at first order a balance of the explicit t_k terms with the remaining terms lumped together in d_k . In particular this seems to require that $(\clubsuit) q_{kl} = q_{lk}$ (which is true since the sum of residues of a meromorphic differential is zero - cf. (6.20)) so that $\sum q_{kl} t_k (z^l/l) = \sum t_k \sum q_{lk} (z^l/l)$. Then the explicit t_k terms in $\Delta \hat{F}$ cancel the term $\sum t_j \sum q_{mj} (z^m/m)$ in (6.14) and we can determine d_k

provided the theta function terms have a suitable expansion.

In fact one can look at the theta function balance by directly comparing

$$A = \frac{\Theta\left(\mathcal{A}(P_\infty) - \sum \frac{z^j}{j} \frac{(\Omega_{jk})}{2\pi i} + \tilde{z}\right)}{\Theta(\mathcal{A}(P_\infty) + \tilde{z})}; \quad (6.15)$$

$$B = \frac{\Theta(\mathcal{A}(P) + \tilde{z})\Theta(\mathcal{A}(P_\infty) + z_0)}{\Theta(\mathcal{A}(P_\infty) + \tilde{z})\Theta(\mathcal{A}(P) + z_0)}$$

First we note some formulas from [5, 15, 18, 71]. Using the Riemann bilinear relations one can show that if $d\tilde{\Omega}_n = (z^{-n} + O(z))dz$ then

$$\oint_{B_j} d\tilde{\Omega}_n = \tilde{\Omega}_{nj} = -\frac{2\pi i}{(n-1)!} \partial_z^n \omega_j|_{z=0} = -\frac{2\pi i}{(n-1)} \sigma_{j,n-1} \quad (6.16)$$

where $d\omega_j = f_j dz = -\sum_1^\infty \sigma_{jm} z^{m-1} dz = -\sum_0^\infty \sigma_{j,p+1} z^p dz$ with $\omega_j \sim -\sum_1^\infty \sigma_{jm} (z^m/m)$. Note also that $\partial^{n-1} f_j|_{z=0} = -\sigma_{jn} (n-1)!$ so

$$\tilde{\Omega}_{n+1,j} = -\frac{2\pi i}{n} \sigma_{jn} = -\frac{2\pi i}{n!} \partial^{n-1} f_j \Big|_{z=0} \quad (6.17)$$

as in [18] for example. Now in [68] one writes

$$\oint_{B_j} d\Omega_n = \Omega_{nj} = -2\pi i \text{Res } z^{-n} d\omega_j = 2\pi i \sigma_{jn} \quad (6.18)$$

and this is correct. To see this go to the derivation in [71] where one shows by the Riemann bilinear relations that

$$\begin{aligned} \oint_{B_j} d\Omega_n &= \Omega_{nj} = \sum \left(\oint_{A_i} d\omega_j \oint_{B_i} d\Omega_n - \oint_{B_i} d\omega_j \oint_{A_i} d\Omega_n \right) = \\ &= 2\pi i \text{Res}(\omega_j d\Omega_n) = 2\pi i \text{Res} \left(-\sum \sigma_{jm} \frac{z^m}{m} \right) \cdot \left(-nz^{-n-1} - \sum q_{mn} z^{m-1} \right) dz = 2\pi i \sigma_{jn} \end{aligned} \quad (6.19)$$

Note also at this point that since the sum of residues of a meromorphic differential is zero, one can write

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Res } \Omega_m d\Omega_n &= q_{nm} - q_{mn} = 0 = \\ &= \text{Res} \left[z^{-m} - \sum_1^\infty q_{pm} \frac{z^p}{p} \right] \cdot \left[-nz^{-n-1} - \sum_1^\infty q_{rn} z^{rn} z^{r-1} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (6.20)$$

showing that $q_{mn} = q_{nm}$. Further we remark that $\text{Res } d(\omega_j d\Omega_n) = 0 = \text{Res } d\omega_j \Omega_n + \text{Res } \omega_j d\Omega_n$.

Now to deal with (6.15) one can write

$$\Theta\left(\mathcal{A}(P_\infty) - \sum \frac{z^j}{j} \frac{(\Omega_{jk})}{2\pi i} + \tilde{z}\right) = \Theta\left(\mathcal{A}(P) - \int_{P_\infty}^P (d\omega_k) - \sum \frac{z^j}{j} \frac{(\Omega_{jk})}{2\pi i} + \tilde{z}\right) \quad (6.21)$$

Since $\Omega_{jk} = 2\pi i \sigma_{kj}$ and $-\int_{P_\infty}^P d\omega_k = -\omega_k = \sum \sigma_{km} (z^m/m)$ we have a cancellation $\sum \sigma_{km} (z^m/m) - \sum \sigma_{kj} (z^j/j) = 0$ for $1 \leq k \leq g$. It follows that

$$\Theta\left(\mathcal{A}(P_\infty) - \sum \frac{z^j}{j} (\Omega_{jk}) + \tilde{z}\right) = \Theta(\mathcal{A}(P) + \tilde{z}) \quad (6.22)$$

and

$$\frac{A}{B} = \frac{\Theta(\mathcal{A}(P) + z_0)}{\Theta(\mathcal{A}(P_\infty) + z_0)} \quad (6.23)$$

This will then lead to $d_k = d_k(\alpha)$. Indeed (6.14) becomes now (after cancellation of the t_j terms)

$$0 = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k,l=1}^{\infty} q_{kl} \frac{z^{k+l}}{kl} - i \sum_1^g \sum_1^{\infty} \alpha_j \sigma_{jk} \frac{z^k}{k} - \sum_1^{\infty} d_k \frac{z^k}{k} + \log \left(\frac{A}{B} \right) \quad (6.24)$$

Writing $\mathcal{A}(P) = \mathcal{A}(P_\infty) + (\int_{P_\infty}^P d\omega_j)$ and referring to [27] one has for $\tilde{z} = \mathcal{A}(P_\infty) + z_0$

$$\log \Theta \left(\left(\int_{P_\infty}^P d\omega_j \right) + \tilde{z} \right) - \log \Theta(\tilde{z}) = - \sum_{j=1}^g \sum_1^{\infty} (\log \Theta)_j(\tilde{z}) \sigma_{jm} \frac{z^m}{m} + \dots \quad (6.25)$$

Putting this in (6.24) yields $d_k = d_k(\alpha)$ (cf. [2, 18] for another version of this).

For perspective however let us make now a few background observations. First we refer first to [12] where it is proved that $F_{mn} = F_{nm}$ in $\mathcal{B}_n = \lambda^n - \sum_1^{\infty} (F_{nm}/m) \lambda^{-m}$ (the F_{mn} being treated as algebraic symbols with two indices). Since near the point at infinity we have $\Omega_n \sim \lambda^n - \sum_1^{\infty} (q_{mn}/m) \lambda^{-m}$ the same sort of proof by residues is suggested ($F_{mn} = -\text{Res}_\lambda[\mathcal{B}_n d\lambda^m]$) but we recall that $\mathcal{B}_n = \lambda_+^n$ so there is an underlying λ for all $\mathcal{B}_n$ which makes the proof possible. Here this is not a priori evident. For example $(\bullet\clubsuit\bullet) p = \lambda - \sum_1^{\infty} (H_j/j) \lambda^{-j}$ corresponds to $P = \lambda + \sum_1^{\infty} P_{j+1} \lambda^{-j}$ in [12] with $P_{j+1} = F_{1j}/j$ (i.e. $H_j \sim -F_{1j}$) and the “inverse” is $\lambda = P + \sum_1^{\infty} U_{n+1} P^{-n}$ (arising from a Lax operator L via dKP). The corresponding inverse for $(\bullet\clubsuit\bullet)$ then characterizes λ in terms of p but one does not expect $\Omega_n \sim \lambda_+^n$. The matter is somewhat subtle. Indeed the BA function is defined from the Riemann surface via $d\Omega_n$, $d\omega_j$, and normalizations. It then produces a unique asymptotic expansion at ∞ which characterizes ψ near ∞ in terms of λ and hence must characterize the $d\Omega_n$ and $d\omega_j$ asymptotically. Moreover the normalizations must be built into these expansions since they were used in determining ψ . But the formal algebraic determination of $\mathcal{B}_n$ via λ_+^n is a consequence of relating the $d\Omega_n$ to operators $L_n = L_+^n$ as in [58]. Applying this reasoning it is suggested that $(\bullet\clubsuit\bullet)$ is valid as a consequence of the BA function linking the differentials and the asymptotic expansions. Note that it is not stated that $q_{ij} = F_{ji}$ when $F_{ij} \sim \partial_i \partial_j F$, and this point will be clarified below. When slow variables T_n are introduced the moduli h_k will be functions of the T_n ($h_k \sim$ branch points for hyperelliptic curves). This means that a priori the normalized differentials $d\Omega_n$ and $d\omega_j$ can depend on the T_n , along with B_{ij} , etc. The construction of $d\mathcal{S} = \sum T_n d\Omega_n + \sum a_j d\omega_j$ such that $\partial_n d\mathcal{S} = d\Omega_n$ and $\partial_n a_j = 0$ is somewhat subtle and we will look at this below following [16, 44]. Let us also say a few words about the construction (6.5), where we recall the formulas (5.22) for example for the times T_j . In the present situation we simply think of $d\mathcal{S} = QdE$ in which case (5.22) becomes $T_j = (1/j) \text{Res}_\infty \lambda^{-j} d\mathcal{S}$. Note here from $d\mathcal{S} = \sum T_n d\Omega_n + \sum a_j d\omega_j$ with $d\Omega_n = [n\lambda^{n-1} + O(\lambda^{-2})]d\lambda$ one obtains immediately $\text{Res}_\infty (1/m) \lambda^{-m} d\mathcal{S} = T_m$. As for the formula $\partial_n F = \text{Res}_\infty \lambda^n d\mathcal{S} = -\text{Res}_0 z^{-n} d\mathcal{S}$ we recall first the form of S in dKP, namely from Section 4.1, $S = \sum T_n \lambda^n + \sum_1^{\infty} S_{j+1} \lambda^{-j}$ where in fact $S_{j+1} = -(1/j) \partial_j F$ or simply $S_{j+1} \sim -(1/j) F_j$ for F_j an algebraic symbol (cf. (4.5) and [12]). Then in the dKP case $d\mathcal{S} = (\sum n T_n \lambda^{n-1} + \sum_1^{\infty} \partial_j F \lambda^{-j-1}) d\lambda$ so $\text{Res}_\infty \lambda^n d\mathcal{S} = \partial_n F \sim F_n$ is immediate. The present situation with $d\mathcal{S} = \sum T_n d\Omega_n + \sum a_j d\omega_j$, $d\Omega_n = [n\lambda^{n-1} + \sum q_{mn} \lambda^{-m-1}]d\lambda$, and $d\omega_j = \sum \sigma_{jm} \lambda^{-m-1} d\lambda$ gives $\text{Res}_\infty \lambda^k d\mathcal{S} = \sum T_n q_{kn} + \sum a_j \sigma_{jk}$ and this is better treated indirectly as indicated below; note this suggests $F_{km} = q_{km}$ (cf. [18]).

Let us make some comments around the development in [44] (cf. also [16]). For situations arising

in Seiberg-Witten (SW) theory it is desired to find $d\mathcal{S} = \sum T_n d\Omega_n + \sum a_j d\omega_j$ with $\partial_n d\mathcal{S} = d\Omega_n$ and $\partial_n a_j = 0$ so that (T_n, a_j) can be taken as independent variables with moduli $h_k = h_k(T, a)$ ($1 \leq k \leq K$ - note generally $K > g$). Here the moduli automatically depend on the slow variables T_n and hence a priori so do the differentials. First one notes that differentials $d\hat{\Omega}_n$, having the same asymptotic properties as the $d\Omega_n$ (but unnormalized), can be selected via $d\hat{\Omega}_n = d[\lambda^n - \sum_1^\infty \alpha_{in}(\lambda^{-i}/i)]$ with α_{in} “arbitrary” and T independent. Then we write $d\omega_j = -\sum_1^\infty \sigma_{jm} z^{m-1} dz = \sum_{jm} \lambda^{-m-1} d\lambda$ where the σ_{jm} depend on $h = (h_k)$ (and thence on T). Now a general desideratum in SW theory is that $\partial d\mathcal{S}/\partial h_k = \sum \beta_{jk} d\omega_j$ and to achieve this one picks first the $d\hat{\Omega}_n$ to have this property. Thus the α_{in} become functions of h_k (hence of T) and we can specify $\partial d\hat{\Omega}_n/\partial h_k = \sum_1^g \sigma_{ki}^n d\omega_i$ (for essentially arbitrary σ_{ki}^n - modulo the production of analytic functions, which seems to allow enough flexibility here). Note $\partial d\hat{\Omega}_n/\partial h_k = [\sum_1^g (\partial \alpha_{in}/\partial h_k) \lambda^{-i-1}] d\lambda$ which can be written as a linear combination of the $d\omega_j$ for each n via

$$\frac{\partial \alpha_{in}}{\partial h_k} = \sum_j \sigma_{kj}^n \sigma_{ji} \quad (6.26)$$

This defines $\partial \alpha_{in}/\partial h_k$ and hence the α_{in} via the σ_{kj}^n ; a priori any (reasonable) collection of σ_{kj}^n should do. To relate the $d\hat{\Omega}_n$ to $d\Omega_n$ we write then

$$d\hat{\Omega}_n = d\Omega_n + \sum_1^g c_i^n d\omega_i; \quad c_i^n = \oint_{A_i} d\hat{\Omega}_n \quad (6.27)$$

Now impose the requirement $\partial_n d\mathcal{S} = d\Omega_n$ while assuming $d\mathcal{S} = \sum u_m(T) d\hat{\Omega}_m$ (which guarantees that $\partial d\mathcal{S}/\partial h_k = \sum \beta_{jk} d\omega_j$). This leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_n d\mathcal{S} &= \sum \left[\frac{\partial u_m}{\partial T_n} d\hat{\Omega}_m + u_m \sum \frac{\partial d\hat{\Omega}_m}{\partial h_k} \partial_n h_k \right] = \\ &= \sum \left[\partial_n u_m d\hat{\Omega}_m + u_m \sum \partial_n h_k \sum \sigma_{ki}^m d\omega_i \right] = d\Omega_n = d\hat{\Omega}_n - \sum c_i^n d\omega_i \end{aligned} \quad (6.28)$$

This implies

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_n u_m &= \delta_{mn} \Rightarrow u_m = T_m; \\ \sum \partial_n h_k \left(\sum T_m \sigma_{ki}^m \right) &= \sum \partial_n h_k \hat{\sigma}_{ki} = -c_i^n \end{aligned} \quad (6.29)$$

where $\hat{\sigma}_{ki} = \sum_m T_m \sigma_{ki}^m$. The equation ($\spadesuit\spadesuit\spadesuit\spadesuit$) $\sum \partial_n h_k \hat{\sigma}_{ki} = -c_i^n$ here represents the Whitham dynamics for the moduli h_k . We note that the $\sigma_{jm}(h)$ are inflexible but the terms σ_{kj}^n are flexible; they determine the c_i^n from (6.27) and the $\hat{\sigma}_{ki}$ as in (6.29). The Whitham dynamics are then “compatible” equations in some sense - given a choice of σ_{ki}^n they describe a compatible variation of moduli; however they may not be determining for h_k unless $K = g$ with $\hat{\sigma}_{ki}$ an invertible square matrix. Now write

$$\begin{aligned} d\mathcal{S} &= \sum T_m d\Omega_m + \sum T_m \sum c_i^m d\omega_i = \\ &= \sum T_m d\Omega_m + \sum a_i d\omega_i; \quad a_i = \sum T_m c_i^m = \oint_{A_i} d\mathcal{S} \end{aligned} \quad (6.30)$$

and look at the requirement $\partial_n a_i = 0$ which would yield a_i as an independent variable with $h_k = h_k(T_n, z_i)$ along with $\partial d\mathcal{S}/\partial a_i = d\omega_i$. This situation is handled in [44] via an assumption $K = g$ leading to determination of the $\partial_n h_k$ via ($\clubsuit\clubsuit\clubsuit\clubsuit$) $\partial_n h_k = -\sum c_i^n \hat{\sigma}_{ik}^{-1}$. Additional calculation

yields then $(\partial h_k / \partial a_j)|_{T=c} = \hat{\sigma}_{jk}^{-1}(h)$. One can also examine matters however without making any assumption on K . Thus e.g. given (6.30), $\partial_n a_j = 0$ requires

$$\partial_n a_j = \partial_n \oint_{A_j} d\mathcal{S} = \oint_{A_j} d\Omega_n = 0 \quad (6.31)$$

which is automatically true for this standard normalization of $d\Omega_n$. Therefore without explicitly solving for $h_k(T_n, a_j)$ we can say that this form prevails when the “Whitham equations” ($\spadesuit\spadesuit\spadesuit$) for h_k have a solution (perhaps not unique). In these circumstances we will have also $\partial d\mathcal{S} / \partial a_i = d\omega_i$ and

$$a_j^D = \oint_{B_j} d\mathcal{S} = \oint_{B_j} \left(\sum a_i d\omega_i + \sum T_n d\Omega_n \right) = \sum a_i B_{ij} + \sum T_n \Omega_{nj} \quad (6.32)$$

Let us develop this a little further following [68]. We will simply repeat some of the argument there since it is instructive and revealing. We assume the $d\Omega_n$ and $d\omega_j$ are specified as before with $d\Omega_n = (-nz^{-n-1} - \sum_1^\infty q_{mn} z^{m-1})dz$ and $d\omega_j = -\sum_1^\infty \sigma_{jm} z^{m-1}dz$. The standard Whitham equations based on times T_n and a_j are (see Section 5)

$$\partial_n d\Omega_m = \partial_m d\Omega_n; \quad \partial_n d\omega_j = \frac{\partial d\Omega_n}{\partial a_j}; \quad \frac{\partial d\omega_j}{\partial a_i} = \frac{\partial d\omega_i}{\partial a_j} \quad (6.33)$$

This form automatically leads to a differential $d\mathcal{S}$ such that

$$\partial_n d\mathcal{S} = d\Omega_n; \quad \frac{\partial d\mathcal{S}}{\partial a_j} = d\omega_j \quad (6.34)$$

for which (6.33) describes compatibility conditions. Then one is led (automatically) to construct a function F satisfying (6.5). The consistency of this stipulation (6.5) is ensured by (6.33) and the Riemann bilinear relations. For example to prove $\partial_n(\partial F / \partial a_i) = \partial(\partial_n F) / \partial a_i$ using the formulas of (6.5) one can write ($\Omega_n = \int^P d\Omega_n$)

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial T_n} \left(\frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{B_i} d\mathcal{S} \right) &= \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{B_i} d\Omega_n = \\ &= -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \sum_1^g \left\{ \oint_{A_j} d\Omega_n \oint_{B_j} d\omega_i - \oint_{A_j} d\omega_i \oint_{B_j} d\Omega_n \right\} = \\ &= -Res_\infty \omega_n d\omega_i = -Res z^{-n} d\omega_i \end{aligned} \quad (6.35)$$

(cf. (5.37) and (6.19)). Finally one shows that $\partial_n \partial_m F = \partial_m \partial_n F$ via

$$\begin{aligned} -\partial_n Res z^{-m} d\mathcal{S} &= -Res z^{-m} d\Omega_n = q_{mn} = \\ &= -Res z^{-m} \left[-nz^{-n-1} - \sum_1^\infty q_{pn} z^{p-1} \right] dz \end{aligned} \quad (6.36)$$

whereas $\partial_m Res z^{-n} d\mathcal{S} = q_{nm}$. From the relation (6.5) we see also that the local behavior of $d\mathcal{S}$ can be described in terms of F via

$$d\mathcal{S} = -\sum n T_n z^{-n-1} - \sum_1^\infty \partial_n F z^{n-1} \quad (6.37)$$

References

- [1] M. Adler and P. vanMoerbeke, *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 147 (1992), 25-56; *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 47 (1994), 5-37
- [2] L. Martinez Alonso and L. Moreno, *Chaos, solitons, and fractals*, 5 (1995), 2213-2237
- [3] S. Aoyama and Y. Kodama, *Mod. Phys. Lett. A*, 9 (1994), 2481-2492; hep-th 9505122
- [4] H. Baker, *Abelian functions*, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1897
- [5] E. Belokolos, A. Bobenko, V. Enolskij, A. Its, and V. Matveev, *Algebro-geometric approach to nonlinear integrable equations*, Springer, 1994
- [6] A. Bilal, hep-th 9601007
- [7] A. Bloch and Y. Kodama, *SIAM Jour. Appl. Math.*, 52 (1992), 909-928
- [8] G. Bonelli and M. Matone, hep-th 9605090
- [9] R. Carroll, *Topics in soliton theory*, North-Holland, 1991
- [10] R. Carroll, *Applicable Anal.*, 49 (1993), 1-31; 56 (1995), 147-164
- [11] R. Carroll, *Proc. First World Cong. Nonlinear Analysts*, deGruyter, Berlin, 1995, Vol. 1, pp. 241-252
- [12] R. Carroll and Y. Kodama, *Solution of the dispersionless Hirota equations*, hep-th 9506007, *Jour. Phys. A*, 28 (1995), 6373-6387
- [13] R. Carroll, *Jour. Nonlin. Sci.*, 4 (1994), 519-544; *Teor. Mat. Fizika*, 99 (1994), 220-225
- [14] R. Carroll, *Proc. NEEDS 94*, World Scientific, 1995, pp. 24-33
- [15] R. Carroll, solv-int 9511009
- [16] R. Carroll, solv-int 9606005, *Proc. Second World Congress Nonlinear Analysts*, Athens, 1996, North-Holland, to appear
- [17] R. Carroll, hep-th 9607219, *Mod. Phys. Lett. A*, to appear
- [18] R. Carroll, *Some kernels on a Riemann surface*, to appear
- [19] R. Carroll, *Lecture notes on KdV, KP, Toda, TFT, susy, integrability, Riemann surfaces, matrix models, LG and SW theories, etc.*, 542 pages, Univ. of Illinois, Urbana, 1995-1996
- [20] R. Carroll, hep-th 9610216
- [21] I. Cherednik, *Basic methods of soliton theory*, World Scientific, 1996
- [22] E. D'Hoker, I. Krichever, and D. Phong, hep-th 9609041, 9609145, and 9610156
- [23] R. Dijkgraaf, H. Verlinde, and E. Verlinde, *Nucl. Phys. B*, 352 (1991), 59-86
- [24] R. Donagi and E. Witten, *Nucl. Phys. B*, 460 (1996), 299-334
- [25] B. Dubrovin and S. Novikov, *Russ. Math. Surv.*, 44 (1989), 35-124

- [26] B. Dubrovin, Dokl. Akad. Nauk. SSSR, 27 (1983), 665-669
- [27] B. Dubrovin, Russ. Math. Surv., 36 (1981), 11-92
- [28] B. Dubrovin, I. Krichever, and S. Novikov, Math. Phys. Rev., 3 (1982), 1-150
- [29] B. Dubrovin and S. Novikov, Math. Phys. Rev., 9 (1991), 3-136
- [30] B. Dubrovin, Math. USSR, Izvestia, 19 (1982), 285-296
- [31] B. Dubrovin, Integrable systems and quantum groups, Lecture notes in math. 1620, Springer, 1995, pp. 120-348
- [32] B. Dubrovin, Nucl. Phys. B, 379 (1992), 627-689
- [33] B. Dubrovin, Comm. Math. Phys., 145 (1992), 195-207
- [34] T. Eguchi and S. Yang, Mod. Phys. Lett. A, 11 (1996), 131-138
- [35] H. Farkas and I. Kra, Riemann surfaces, Springer, 1992
- [36] J. Fay, Theta functions on Riemann surfaces, Springer Lect. Notes Math., 352, 1973
- [37] H. Flaschka, M. Forest, and D. McLaughlin, Comm. Pure Appl. Math., 33 (1980), 739-784
- [38] O. Forster, Lectures on Riemann surfaces, Springer, 1992
- [39] M. Forest and D. McLaughlin, Stud. Appl. Math., 68 (1983), 11-59; SIAM Jour. Appl. Math., 44 (1984), 287-300
- [40] F. Fucito, A. Gamba, M. Martellini, and O. Ragnisco, Inter. Jour. Mod. Phys. B, 6 (1992), 2123-2147
- [41] J. Gibbons and Y. Kodama, Singular limits of dispersive waves, Plenum, 1994, pp. 61-66
- [42] P. Griffiths, Introduction to algebraic curves, Amer. Math. Soc., 1989
- [43] P. Grinevich, A. Orlov, and E. Schulman, Important developments in soliton theory, Springer, 1993, pp. 283-301
- [44] H. Itoyama and A. Morozov, hep-th 9511126, 9512161, and 9601168
- [45] N. Kawamoto, Y. Namikawa, A. Tsuchiya, and Y. Yamada, Comm. Math. Phys., 116 (1988), 247-308
- [46] A. Klemm, W. Lerche, and S. Theisen, Inter. Jour. Mod. Phys. A, 11 (1996), 1929-1973
- [47] Y. Kodama and J. Gibbons, Proceedings Fourth Workshop on Nonlinear and Turbulent Processes in Physics, World Scientific, 1990, pp. 166-180
- [48] Y. Kodama, Lecture Lyon workshop, 1991, unpublished
- [49] Y. Kodama and J. Gibbons, Phys. Lett. A, 135 (1989), 167-170
- [50] Y. Kodama, Phys. Lett. A, 129 (1988), 223-226; Prog. Theor. Phys., Supp. 94 (1988), 184-194
- [51] I. Krichever, Funct. Anal. Prilozh., 22 (1988), 200-213

- [52] I. Krichever, Russ. Math. Surv., 44 (1989), 145-225
- [53] I. Krichever, Acta Math. Applicandae, 39 (1995), 93-125
- [54] I. Krichever, Math. Phys. Rev., 9 (1991), 1-103
- [55] I. Krichever, Funct. Anal. Prilozh., 20 (1986), 203-214
- [56] I. Krichever, Comm. Pure Appl. Math., 47 (1994), 437-475
- [57] I. Krichever, Comm. Math. Phys., 143 (1992), 415-429
- [58] I. Krichever and D. Phong, hep-th 9604199
- [59] I. Krichever, hep-th 9611158
- [60] P. Lax, C. Levermore, and S. Venakides, Important developments in soliton theory, Springer, 1993, pp. 205-241
- [61] A. Maltsev, solv-int 9611008
- [62] A. Marshakov, A. Mironov, and A. Morozov, hep-th 9607109
- [63] E. Martinec and N. Warner, hep-th 9509161
- [64] M. Matone, Phys. Lett. B, 357 (1995), 342-348; hep-th 9506181
- [65] J. Matsukidaira, J. Satsuma, and W. Strampp, Jour. Math. Phys., 31 (1990), 1426-1434
- [66] D. McLaughlin, Physica 3D (1981), 335-343
- [67] D. Mumford, Lectures on theta, 1 and 2, Birkhäuser, 1983-84
- [68] T. Nakatsu and K. Takasaki, hep-th 9509162
- [69] S. Novikov, S. Manakov, L. Pitaevskij, and V. Zakharov, Theory of solitons, Plenum, 1984
- [70] N. Seiberg and E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. B, 426 (1994), 19-52
- [71] J. Sonnenschein, S. Theisen, and S. Yankielowicz, hep-th 9510129
- [72] G. Springer, Introduction to Riemann surfaces, Chelsea, 1981
- [73] I. Taimanov, alg-geom 9609016
- [74] K. Takasaki and T. Takebe, Inter. Jour. Mod. Phys. A, Supp. 1992, pp. 889-922; Rev. Math. Phys., 7 (1995), 743-808
- [75] K. Takasaki and T. Nakatsu, hep-th 9603069
- [76] S. Venakides, Comm. Pure Appl. Math., 38 (1985), 125-155 and 883-909; Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., 301 (1987), 189-226; Comm. Pure Appl. Math., 42 (1989), 711-728; Comm. Pure Appl. Math., 43 (1990), 335-361
- [77] E. Verlinde and H. Verlinde, Nucl. Phys. B, 288 (1987), 357-396
- [78] G. Whitham, Linear and nonlinear waves, Wiley, 1974
- [79] T. Yoneya, Comm. Math. Phys., 144 (1992), 623-639; Inter. Jour. Mod. Phys. A, 7 (1992), 4015-4038